UNIVERSITY OF SHERBROOKE

La lecture récréative de romans et les compétences en littératie au niveau collégial

Recreational Long-form Fiction Reading and College-level Literacy Achievement

By

Dana E. Bath

Masters paper submitted to the Faculty of Education

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Masters of Education (M.Ed.)

Master Teacher Program (PERFORMA)

August 2018

UNIVERSITY OF SHERBROOKE

La lecture récréative de romans et les compétences en littératie au niveau collégial

Recreational Long-form Fiction Reading and College-level Literacy Achievement

By

Dana E. Bath

A été évalué par un jury composé des personnes suivantes:

Carolyn Lewis-Dellah, Ph.D.	Directrice de l'essai
Stephen G. Taylor, Ph.D.	Évaluateur de l'essai

Essai en maîtrise accepté le 10 septembre 2018

SUMMARY

This study aimed to examine habits around – and, secondarily, attitudes toward – recreational reading of long-form fiction (novels) in a multi-cultural, multi-lingual student population with a broad range of academic ability, and to determine whether there was any association between such variables and the students' levels of literacy skill. The purpose of the study was to provide English teachers at CEGEP Vanier College and beyond with information about students' reading backgrounds that might help them to make more informed decisions about their curriculum and pedagogy. It was hypothesized that students placed in higher-level 101 courses would report stronger recreational novel-reading habits and more positive attitudes toward reading fiction than those in lower levels.

A sample of Vanier College students in fall-semester English 101 courses in 2016 completed a survey questionnaire in which they provided demographic information, as well as information on their recreational reading preferences; their attitudes toward reading books, especially books of fiction; their novel-reading habits in the previous year, and their family of origin's reading habits and attitudes toward reading. Their responses were cross-tabulated with their 101 course placement levels (non-remedial, first-tier remedial, and second-tier remedial) to reveal associations. Students' qualitative responses were examined, and some interesting cases were isolated and treated as case studies. The data showed that there are indeed some important associations between a student's literacy level and the student's attitudes and preferences regarding reading novels for recreation. Associations between student reading habits and literacy level remained unsubstantiated, but warrant further study with a more comprehensive sample.

Reader-response theory (Daniels, 2002) posits that students cannot take an analytical approach to literature before experiencing literature personally, and examining and understanding their own responses to it. It could be argued, based on this theory and the data collected in this study, that teachers of remedial courses should endeavour to provide their students with experiences that will help them develop a love of reading and an inclination to do more of it in their own time. Such an argument would entail re-examining not only teachers' individual curricula and pedagogy, but also Ministerial objectives for CEGEP English courses. Further research would be needed in order to determine ways that teachers might best respond productively to this difference in background reading experiences and attitudes, but some examples from the existing literature on fostering recreational reading habits, enjoyment and skill are provided here for consideration.

The hope is that, by looking at overall associations between recreational long-form fiction reading and 101 course placement, as well as by examining particular cases of students' literacy skills and reading habits and attitudes around reading, this study of a very particular college in a very particular cultural and academic context will provide Vanier College English teachers with information that can help them examine their own curricular choices and pedagogical approaches, both in their 101 courses and beyond. It is also hoped that this information, analysis and reflection will prove useful to English teachers at other Quebec CEGEPs, as well as to Quebec educators generally, and to post-secondary English educators beyond the Quebec system who work in similar settings.

RESUME

La présente recherche vise principalement l'étude des habitudes et ensuite des attitudes concernant la lecture récréative de romans dans un milieu étudiant multiculturel et multilingue où l'on retrouve une vaste gamme de compétences académiques. Ce travail cherche à découvrir un lien entre ces variables et les compétences étudiantes en littératie au niveau collégial. Le but est de fournir aux enseignants du cégep, et du département d'anglais du collège Vanier en particulier, des informations concernant le contexte de lecture de leurs étudiants afin que ces enseignants puissent planifier leur curriculum et leur pédagogie de façon mieux informée. L'hypothèse de départ est qu'un étudiant placé à un niveau plus élevé de cours d'anglais 101 indiquera une tendance plus élevée à lire des romans pour leur plaisir et qu'il aura une attitude plus positive envers la lecture de romans en général, comparé aux étudiants placés à des niveaux moins élevés.

Le collège Vanier est un cégep (collège d'étude générale et professionnelle) anglophone situé à Montréal, dans la province canadienne de Québec. La population étudiante démontre une grande diversité culturelle et linguistique et représente une grande gamme de compétences académiques. Les nouveaux étudiants suivent un de trois niveaux d'anglais 101: 101-MA pour l'étudiant qui démontre un niveau de littératie adéquate aux études collégiales; 101-MB pour l'étudiant qui démontre des difficultés de compréhension, d'analyse, ou d'expression écrite; et 101-MC pour l'étudiant qui démontre des difficultés linguistiques évidentes et importantes, y inclus les erreurs majeurs de deuxième langue. La répartition des élèves est décidée par les résultats du test de placement (Vanier College Placement Test). Les compétences ministérielles sont néanmoins identiques pour les trois niveaux du cours 101 (en effet, d'autres cégeps font la division de différentes façons ou n'ont aucune répartition du cours 101). Un des principaux objectifs de chaque niveau est qu'un étudiant rédige un

analyse littéraire de 750 mots, mais le contenu du cours est en grande partie laissé à la discrétion de l'enseignant. La répartition des élèves en anglais 101 vise à régler certains problèmes de littératie, mais il n'y a aucune répartition de ce genre dans les cours qui suivent, dont trois cours de littérature ou les élèves doivent démontrer les mêmes compétences d'analyse littéraire et de compréhension, peu importe leur niveau de compétence, leur historique et leur contexte, ou leur exposition à la lecture.

En automne 2016 un échantillon d'élèves du collège Vanier inscrits en anglais 101 a complété un questionnaire fournissant des données démographiques; des informations portant sur leur préférences de lecture récréative et leurs habitudes récentes de lecture de romans; et des informations portant sur les préférences de lecture, les habitudes de lecture, et les attitudes envers la lecture de leur famille d'origine. Les réponses à ce questionnaire ont alors été croisées aux niveau d'anglais 101 (MA, MB, MC) pour révéler des associations. Les réponses qualitatives des étudiants ont été examinées et analysées, et certains cas particuliers ont par la suite été traités comme études de cas. Les données ont démontrées qu'il y a en effet certaines associations importantes entre le niveau de littératie et les attitudes étudiantes envers la lecture récréative de romans. Par contre, les associations entre le niveau de littératie et les habitudes de lecture ne sont pas étayées, mais celles-ci méritent d'être étudiées en profondeur avec un échantillon plus vaste .

Selon la théorie de la réponse du lecteur (Daniels, 2002), les étudiants ne peuvent adopter une démarche analytique envers la littérature qu'après avoir eu, examiné et compris une expérience littéraire plus personnelle. L'enseignant qui cherche à développer un échafaudage efficace qui permettra à l'étudiant d'acquérir de nouveaux connaissances et compétences doit comprendre qu'il ne sert à rien de demander à l'étudiant de compléter des tâches qui n'ont aucun lien avec ses schémas existants. Par contre, mieux connaître les expériences et les pratiques courantes des étudiants concernant la lecture récréative pourrait aider aux enseignants à réajuster leurs attentes et à adapter leurs choix pédagogiques et curriculaires, pour pouvoir mieux répondre aux lacunes de connaissances, compétences et motivation chez ceux-ci. S'appuyant sur cette théorie et les données recueillies, on pourrait faire valoir que

ceux qui enseignent les cours d'appoint se doivent d'offrir aux étudiants des expériences promouvant l'amour de la lecture et une volonté accrue de lire dans leurs temps libre. Un tel argument entraînerait non seulement une réexamination des pratiques pédagogiques et des choix curriculaires des enseignants, mais aussi des objectifs ministérielles des cours d'anglais au cégep. Des recherches supplémentaires pourraient établir comment mieux répondre aux différentes contextes de lecture, mais certains exemples tirés de la documentation existante sont fournis ici, en particulier à propos de l'encouragement d'habitudes, d'habiletés et de l'appréciation de la lecture récréative.

Il est à espérer qu'en examinant les associations entre le lecture récréative de romans et la répartition d'étudiants en anglais 101, en plus d'examiner des cas particuliers de compétences littéraires, d'habitudes de lecture et d'attitudes envers la lecture, cette étude de la situation précise et particulier pourra fournir aux enseignants du département d'anglais de Vanier les données et l'information nécessaires pour une réexamination de leurs choix pédagogiques et curriculaires, autant pour leurs enseignement du cours 101 que pour d'autres cours. De plus, l'information, l'analyse et la réflexion présenté pourra être utile aux enseignants du cégep, aux enseignants québécois en général et à tout enseignant d'anglais postsecondaire qui fait face à des situations semblables.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS, INITIALISMS AND ACRONYMS

101-MA (or MA) At Vanier College, a stream of English 101 (ministerial number 603-101-MQ) for students who need little to no remedial help.

101-MB (or MB) At Vanier College, a stream of English 101 for students who need remedial help with expression, logical organization, or comprehension.

101-MC (or MC) At Vanier College, a stream of English 101 students who need significant remedial help with expression (sometimes including severe second-language-type errors), logical organization, or comprehension.

CEGEP *Collège d'enseignement général et professionnel* (College for pre-university and professional education).

FVR Free Voluntary Reading: non-directed reading in which one reads books of one's own choosing for the pleasure of reading alone.

SSR Sustained Silent Reading: a school-based type of Free Voluntary Reading (FVR; see above) in which students read books of their own choosing for extended periods of time during school hours.

DEDICATION

For the students and colleagues whom I have tried my best to serve,

and to Scott, for his patience.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks to Dr. Carolyn Dellah for her suggestions, advice, and stimulating conversations. Thanks also to Dr. Shernaz Choksi for her patient tutelage concerning the many challenges of SPSS data analysis. *Merci* to my friend and colleague Marianne Lynch for speedy and impressive translations (and for everything else she does that makes my life easier). Gratitude to Karen White and the Vanier Research Ethics Board for their help with condensing, focusing and perfecting what was initially an unwieldy survey questionnaire. And thanks to Justine Bell for providing her MTP M.Ed. paper as a helpful guide to formatting and organization.

Thank you to my colleagues in Vanier's Faculty of Social and Cultural Studies, Maria-Sophia Grabowiecki and Sandy Khalifa, for allowing me to pilot my survey questionnaire in their Research Methodology classes in the winter semester of 2016. A big thank you to my English Department colleagues Stacey DeWolfe, Nancy Giacomini, Renee Karp, Spiridoula Photopoulos, Mariopi Spanos and Vanessa Vandergrift for allowing me to conduct surveys during their class time during the 2016 fall semester. Thanks also to my friend and colleague Stephen Dinsmore for his gentle, considerate, and unrelenting inquiries and encouragement, and his curiosity about every angle of the results. And eternal gratitude to the Vanier College English Department as a whole for their support of not only my research, but also the important research many of our colleagues are doing for the benefit of our students and students everywhere.

Finally, thank you to the students of Vanier College for their participation and constant inspiration.

INTRODUCTION: DO THEY READ? DOES IT MATTER?

I first began pondering the place of literature and literary analysis in the post-secondary English classroom in 1994, when I read a collection of essays called *Reasonable creatures: Essays on women and feminism*, by one of my favourite opinion columnists, Katha Pollitt (1994). In an article called "Why we read: Canon to the right of me…" Pollitt, a writer for *The Nation* and other important American publications, explores a question that plagued university English departments of that day: what should we require students to read in their English courses?

One faction insisted that students should be exposed to as many classic canonical texts as possible. The other countered that young people were bored and frustrated by such texts, and should be encouraged to read contemporary works with characters, plots and settings with which they could identify. Pollitt outlines the various justifications for both sides, and then explains why both miss the point: none of this would matter if students regularly read for their own enjoyment outside the classroom.

> [T]he assumption underlying the canon debate is that the books on the [course] list are the only books that are going to be read….[A]ll agree not to mention certain things that they themselves, as highly educated people and, one assumes, devoted readers, know perfectly well. For example, that if you read only twenty-five, or fifty, or a hundred books, you can't understand them….And that if you don't have an independent reading life…you won't *like* reading the books on the list and will forget them the minute you finish them. (p. 22)

In his book *Outliers: The story of success*, Malcolm Gladwell (2008) puts forth neurologist Daniel Levitin's theory of "10,000 hours": to become a "world-class" expert at anything, we must invest at least 10,000 hours in practicing that skill (p. 40).

In order to navigate the world of college studies, particularly the literary analysis tasks at the centre of the English literature courses that are core curriculum at Anglophone colleges, students may not need to be "world-class" experts in reading and writing. However, they need to read, understand, and write with a *basic* expertise – college-level competency – and this basic expertise seems to elude large numbers of them. Why is this? Could it be related to a lack of reading practice outside of the classroom? Could it be that they have invested so much less than 10,000 hours in reading that they are not even *competent* readers and writers, much less experts?

A number of recent studies draw connections between fiction reading, specifically, and cognitive abilities that might have an impact on literacy achievement. Is it possible that young people who read a lot of novels in their spare time have an academic advantage over those who don't? Is it possible that reading novels is more strongly associated with literacy skills than reading textbooks, newspapers or blogs?

CEGEP English teachers, their students, and the wider educational community all have an important stake in these questions. If recreational fiction-reading habits, and/or attitudes toward reading fiction (that is, enjoyment of reading fiction and desire to do so), are closely associated with literacy skills, then students who read little fiction on their own and/or dislike reading fiction may be ill-equipped to perform some of the tasks we ask of them in the English classroom, and in their other classes as well.

In this study, I hope to examine a sample of the incoming student population of Vanier College in order to determine two things:

1. How much long-form fiction reading students habitually do outside of school assignments;

2. Whether there is an association between the amount/frequency of this reading and students' literacy skills.

What follows will include a statement of the problem that this study intends to examine, an overview of the conceptual framework upon which this study has been based, a review of the literature on this topic and a statement of the main questions and hypotheses upon which this research was built, a description of the methodology and results of the study, and an analysis and discussion of these results, along with some suggestions for future research on the topic of recreational fiction reading and its association with literacy and academic achievement.

CHAPTER ONE: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

1. CONTEXT

All students entering an Anglophone CEGEP in Quebec must complete four English Literature courses before graduation. According to Ministerial objectives, all these courses must include the reading of literary texts and the production of essays analyzing those texts. Some English courses, especially 101 courses, also incorporate explicit instruction on written expression (grammar etc.), and most incorporate some work on essay composition, but the main thrust of these courses is the appreciation, understanding and analysis of literary forms, genres, techniques and themes.

These tasks are, in my experience and that of many English teachers with whom I've discussed this problem, pedagogically and intellectually valuable for students who already have strong literacy skills and plenty of reading experience. However, for students with poor literacy skills, literary analysis often becomes a series of hoops to jump through and tropes to imitate. At best, they blindly follow five-paragraph essay templates and plug in technical terms like "imagery" and "appeal to authority," dutifully followed by somewhat random quotations as evidence, while having little overall understanding of a text's arguments or themes, craft, and emotional resonance. At worst, they are unable to write literary analysis essays at all, or even to demonstrate a basic understanding of the texts they are required to read.

The Vanier student population is particular in a few ways: it is an unusually demographically diverse college (especially with regard to cultural background, mother tongue, home language and socio-economic factors), many of our students have received most of their previous school instruction in French and not English,

and students' academic skills range from very weak (weak enough to make admission to some other colleges unlikely) to very strong. Within this multi-ethnic, multi-lingual, multi-level context, identifying any particular variables that might contribute to the strength or weakness of a student's literacy skills is very challenging. However, such a specific and special context does provide an opportunity to examine whether the results of previous research, carried out in very different contexts, is consistent here. What can we find out about these particular students' recreational fiction-reading habits and attitudes toward reading fiction? Are there associations between these variables and these students' literacy levels? If so, what can teachers at this institution learn from these associations, and how can they apply what they learn to their curriculum and pedagogy in order to better support their students, and provide more effectively for their students' needs? Finally, can any of these findings be generalized, to similar contexts and beyond?

2. PROBLEM

A paucity of recreational fiction reading might help explain a number of student difficulties, both in English classes and across the curriculum, including:

1. Lack of motivation to read assigned literary (and other) texts;
2. Deficits in terms of reading comprehension;
3. Lack of intuitive ability when it comes to understanding techniques, themes and arguments in texts;
4. Lack of basic writing skills, including natural understanding of grammar, sentence structure, spelling, vocabulary and paragraph structure.

Competence in all these skills – completing and comprehending readings, including long ones; understanding of the craft of literary technique as practiced by

authors; expressing oneself fluently and accurately in written language; organizing one's ideas into paragraphs and essays – is a basic requirement of college-level first-language English courses. Students who often read recreationally may arrive in college with stronger skills than those who do not; what is more, as will be discussed later in these pages, recent research shows that those who often read fiction may have certain cognitive advantages that make them even more capable than those who read widely in other areas. Students whose reading practice is restricted to texts assigned to them in school, on the other hand, may be ill-equipped to undertake the tasks we are asking of them.

When students are accepted at Vanier College, they write an English Placement Test. Their score on the Placement Test determines their 101 English course level: students with strong scores are placed in 101-MA, students with weaker scores in 101-MB, and students with very poor scores in 101-MC (and those with the very weakest scores are streamed into a pre-101 non-credit course called Preparation for College English.) The Ministerial objectives for all three 101 levels are the same (in fact, other CEGEPs stream 101 courses differently or not at all), but while the required course outcomes, such as the ability to produce a 750-word literary analysis essay, are consistent across streams and across CEGEPs, the content of English courses at Vanier - including assigned texts, learning activities, and most assessments - is, aside from some general guidelines given by the English department, largely up to the discretion of the individual teacher. What is more, after an initial streaming into English 101 courses meant to address literacy deficits, Vanier students are required to take three more English literature courses in which they are all asked to demonstrate the same literary analysis and comprehension skills, regardless of their background and level of competence. Therefore, the 101 course provides an opportunity for teachers to begin addressing previous deficits in students' literacy experiences. A fifteen-week course is not enough time in which to compensate for a lifetime of little recreational reading, but there may be measures that teachers, especially of remedial courses, can take to plant some seeds. Teachers of post-introductory courses should

also be aware of the diversity of their students' past recreational reading experiences, the impact that deficits in this experience could have on students' skills, and possible pedagogical and curricular decisions they as teachers could make in order to maximize the learning potential of students who are coming in with little experience of reading as a recreational activity (and little desire to read for any reason).

If English teachers wish to make effective decisions about how to help our students acquire new knowledge and skills – that is, how to scaffold material so our students can learn from it - there is no point in asking students to carry out tasks that are so removed from their current schemata that no connections can be made. Thus, information about their background experiences and ongoing practices where recreational reading is concerned may help us adjust not only our expectations but also our pedagogical and curricular choices, in order to provide for deficits in our students' knowledge and skills. According to the literature on this topic, there is much evidence that recreational reading, especially of long-form fiction (novels), can contribute positively to literacy skills. If it turns out that there is an association for students in remedial English courses at Vanier College - that is, that such students are indeed less likely to enjoy recreational reading and regularly read for fun than are their peers in non-remedial courses - then it could be argued that teachers of remedial courses should endeavour to provide their students with experiences of literature that will help them develop a love of reading and an inclination to do more of it in their own time. This might mean providing these students with experiences that they might have, under different circumstances, been exposed to at home or in school at an earlier age. Such experiences might include choosing their own books, reading freely, sharing their reading experiences with others, and being exposed to a wide variety of books that are accessible and appealing to them.

3. GENERAL OBJECTIVE OF STUDY

Knowledge about these student difficulties, about student recreational fiction (and other) reading habits as well as their attitudes around reading fiction, and about the possible associations between them, might help us make some predictions about the nature of our students' literacy problems. If given more information about our students' background experience in reading, and if willing to make changes to pedagogical approaches based on a clearer understanding of our students' prior knowledge and skills, teachers will be better equipped to lead students to success. The general objective of this study is to gather this information and identify these associations, with the hope that it will lead to further discussion, and possibly even to reconsideration of Ministerial and college curriculum requirements.

CHAPTER TWO: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The major theoretical approach that underpins this investigation is Constructivism, both social and psychological. If we embrace a Constructivist approach to learning, we need to understand, first of all, the social context in which our domain and our curricula have evolved, in order to examine the knowledge, skills and tasks we require of our students and the reasons for asking these things of them. Secondly, we need to have and make use of psychological information about our students' background knowledge and skills in order to effectively scaffold material so our students may acquire new knowledge and skills.

Social Constructivism posits that what we consider "knowledge" is in fact a human construct – we have, as a society, decided what constitutes knowledge, and this "knowledge" is not an objective representation of reality. (Richardson, 2003) English literature became a subject of academic study only in the late 1800s; at the time of its origin, English literary studies might have had much in common with today's Communication Studies programs. Students of English literature would have been engaging, albeit with more profound attention and analysis, in an activity – reading books – that they had been turning to casually for enjoyment for much of their lives, much as our students might turn to film, Netflix, video games or social media. In fact, English as a field of study was not taken terribly seriously at first, as English literature was seen as "entertainment for gentlefolk, to be simply enjoyed or absorbed." (Donald, 2002, p. 234) Over time, university English studies split into two disciplines, literary scholarship and rhetoric (composition), and then a variety of approaches emerged within literary scholarship: historical, theoretical, humanistic, etc.

CEGEP English courses, being generalist, may cover a wide variety of approaches and usually integrate work on composition as well, but CEGEP English

teachers, including those who over the years have developed the Ministerial objectives for CEGEP English studies, have almost without exception been formed in the crucible of university literary scholarship, and so the texts and approaches they tend to value come from a tradition that may lack resonance for, or may even be unrecognizable to, many CEGEP students. Also, college curricula in the domain of English studies were first developed in the late 1960s, when the CEGEPs were established. Decisions were made at that time about what constituted "value" in an English literature education, and this included mostly canonical literary texts that many teachers still focus on in their courses today. At that time, acceptance to a CEGEP pre-university program presumed a certain level of background knowledge and literacy skill on the part of the student. An English teacher would assume that students had, at the very least, read and understood certain literary texts in high school; she might also take for granted that many students spent at least some of their free time reading books for recreation. (There were no video games, no YouTube, and no social media. Where film and television were concerned, there were no streaming services like Netflix, easy purchasing services like iTunes, or illegal downloads over the internet. There were also no online media outlets for print media like newspapers and magazines, and no such thing as a blog. Most students were likely to pick up a book for entertainment once in a while.) This presumption no longer holds true: students are accepted into CEGEP today who might not have graduated from high school thirty years ago, and we can no longer assume that a student in our English class has *ever* read a book for pleasure. However, some of us are still operating as though conditions have not changed since the 1960s or, for that matter, since the 1800s.

Social Constructivism also assumes that associations will be made between the social context we know and the unfamiliar contexts we encounter in new materials. Beach et al. (2006), in their discussion of reading and socio-cultural learning theory, explain that one of the main attractions and rewards of reading literature is the possibility of "constructing text worlds as social worlds" – that is,

identifying with characters through an understanding of "the historical and cultural forces shaping a world" – and applying that understanding to our own lives, as well as to future reading (p. 12). If students arrive in college without a background in constructing "textual/social worlds" in response to texts, especially texts that are meaningful and enjoyable for them, they will not have practiced this cognitive skill enough to apply it to more challenging required texts.

According to Psychological Constructivism, meaning is constructed within an individual mind, and is dependent upon the learner's background knowledge – new knowledge must be attached to the learner's previous schemata in order for the knowledge to be assimilated (Richardson, 2003). According to Atwell (2007), construction of knowledge through reading is a major element of what makes us engaged and capable readers.

> [Reading] fills up the file drawers of long-term memory, increases our vicarious experience, and improves our comprehension of the world and the word. The more we read, the more that has the possibility of making sense to us, and the better we understand what we read…Children read in order to become smarter about the world and how it works. (p. 60, p. 130)

Atwell attempts to address deficits in her students' prior reading experience by running her middle-school English classes as "reading workshops," wherein students choose their own texts from the classroom library and spend class time reading freely and engaging in book-club-type presentations and discussions. Thus, she allows students to respect their own schema and build upon them accordingly.

Stephen Krashen (2004) is one of the champions of recreational reading and its academic, cognitive and literacy benefits, and his arguments and research have many Social and Psychological Constructivist underpinnings. Krashen goes so far as to insist that many hours of school time should be devoted to Sustained Silent

Reading (SSR), a program in which, at set times of day, students, teachers and even staff drop everything and read books they have chosen for themselves. He declares that language is too complex to be learned in detached pieces, in the way reading skills are often taught in classrooms: vocabulary, spelling, comprehension etc. are approached as though they are discrete skills that the student's brain can then magically combine to produce reading competence:

> Our problem in language education is that we have confused cause and effect. We have assumed that we first master language "skills" and then apply these skills….Rather, reading for meaning, reading about things that matter to us, is the cause of literate language development. (p. 150)

Therefore, Krashen says, we need to give students the opportunity and inclination to read for themselves, by providing them with plenty of reading material and time to read, allowing them to choose their own books, modeling recreational reading for them, and valuing the pleasure derived from reading as much as we do the skills it fosters. This approach is clearly, even if not explicitly, Constructivist: when it comes to reading, students need to be given opportunities to gravitate to texts that are meaningful and suitable for them, enabling them to construct their own skills and knowledge based on the skills and knowledge they already possess.

Pedagogical strategies such as Krashen's (2004) SSR free voluntary reading programs and Atwell's (2007) reading workshops all engage students in a "reader-response" approach to the study of literature. Reader-response theory was first championed by Louise Rosenblatt, who pointed out the difference between *efferent* (information-acquiring) and *aesthetic* (enjoyment-seeking) modes of reading (Atwell, 2007) and who discouraged the quest for "correct" interpretations, positing that interpretations are entirely dependent on the reader's prior experience (Daniels, 2002). According to reader-response theory, it is impossible for students to approach literature analytically without first experiencing, examining and understanding their

own personal response (Daniels, 2002). Even writers examining the study of literature at university recognize the role that early engagement with reading plays in their students' current worldview and ability to learn through literature. Donald (2002) reminds us that we want to preserve and even enhance that reading engagement; describing the state of mind university teachers hope their students will bring to literary study, she reflects on what brought us to teach literature in the first place:

> the attachment to literature found among teachers of English is reminiscent of a reader's early attitude of receptivity, plasticity, and innocence before the text…our hesitations, pleasures and self-forgetfulness are the material for all subsequent intellectual reflection. (p. 241)

From this point of view, we may be making cognitive demands on students for which many of them are not prepared. Can a student conduct a sensible and insightful literary analysis of a complex canonical text when he/she is not even accustomed to reading light novels for fun? My study hypothesizes that the answer is a qualified no – that if a student is not practiced in fluidly and unconsciously decoding text for his/her own enjoyment, his/her literacy skills will be impaired, and expecting him/her to engage in insightful literary analysis is not appropriate.

In such cases, we have a few avenues of recourse:

1. We can attempt to provide intensive scaffolding through direct literacy instruction in order to move students from their current level of knowledge and skill to one where they can accomplish the tasks of deep comprehension, insightful analysis, logical organization and accurate expression;
2. We can focus more on approaches and activities that will help students develop their capacity to enjoy reading, including and especially long-form fiction, and to therefore do more of it in their own free time so that their skills

will continue to develop beyond the fifteen weeks they spend in our classroom;

3. We can reconsider the current Ministerial objectives for CEGEP English courses, including the literary analysis test (English Exit Exam) required for graduation.

Given what we know about where our students are coming from, we may need to think more carefully about where we expect them to go over the short time they are with us.

CHAPTER THREE: LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. INTRODUCTION

Although the theoretical orientation of the articles reviewed in this study is not always explicitly constructivist, an underlying premise is that recreational reading supports future learning and skill development, and that a student's background experience as a reader will have an effect on his or her preparedness for school activities, especially literacy activities. These studies cover all levels of age and schooling, from children to mature adults, but most focus on adolescents or young adults, or middle school to university students. Most of the studies were conducted in literacy-related fields and involved English teachers, or literature and language teachers in other languages, or librarians. The original studies often used mixed methods, but with emphasis on quantitative findings; some of the books (Krashen, 2004) and articles (Cullinan, 2000) were mainly syntheses of previous studies, including the authors' own.

Three main themes arise in these books and articles:

1. *What associations can be found between recreational reading and literacy skills/achievement?* It is very difficult to find direct empirical evidence for associations between recreational reading habits and levels of academic and literacy achievement. When such associations are found, it is usually impossible for any causal effect to be identified. However, Belgar et. al. (2012) and Flowers (2003) have conducted interesting classroom studies comparing the use of self-directed pleasure reading with the use of assigned texts, and their results point to the possibility that reading for pleasure might

in fact have a stronger impact on literacy skills than mandatory reading assignments do;

2. *What associations can be made between fiction reading, specifically, and cognitive skills that may influence literacy skills/achievement?* Djikic et. al. (2013) and Ross (2000) have focused attention on the possible cognitive impact of fiction reading, demonstrating that reading literary fiction may help us develop cognitive skills like a reduced need for cognitive closure (a need to seize on answers/solutions before they are necessarily well founded) and an increased capacity for Theory of Mind (the ability to understand what others are experiencing internally). Both Ross and Gilbert & Fister (2011), however, raise concerns about these cognitive skills and their possible negative effect on analytical abilities;

3. *How much, and what kind of, recreational reading do young people do?* Although there is an assumption in the culture at large, and in the culture of English teachers more specifically, that young people are reading less and less, the research on this topic is inconclusive. Nevertheless, looking at a few surveys conducted over the past years by Galik (1999), Hopper (2005), Gilbert & Fister (2011), and Howard (2011) can give us a sense of what, why and how much particular groups of adolescents and young adults have been reading, and whether there has been a general evolution in young people's reading habits. It might also give us a sense of whether a particular population (Vanier College students) is typical in its reading habits, or whether it presents specific challenges.

2. THEMES

2.1 Can Recreational Reading be Associated with Literacy Skills and Achievement?

2.1.1. Overall Literacy Achievement

Echols et al. (1996) wished to determine whether children's literacy activities could predict not only verbal cognitive skills, but also the growth of those skills over time. They collected data from 123 students from fourth, fifth and sixth grades in a rural American elementary school and middle school. The researchers operationalized "literacy activities" through measures of print exposure – the amount of print material children encountered in their day-to-day lives – and they measured this print exposure through two highly reliable and validated standardized tests: the Title Recognition Test and the Author Recognition Test. In these tests, participants receive a list of book titles or author names and indicate the ones they recognize (the tests include foils that help eliminate participants who provide unreliable data based on guessing.) They operationalized "verbal cognitive skills" as vocabulary, spelling, reading comprehension and general knowledge, and measured these skills through a series of adaptations of standardized tests. They measured "growth" by administering these tests to the same children three times over the space of 18 months. The TRT, ART and verbal cognitive skills tests all showed a Cronbach's alpha reliability estimate of .75 or more. The authors found that levels of print exposure can predict growth of verbal cognitive abilities during this developmental period, and they claim that, because their calculations and controls have eliminated some confounding variables, they can cautiously affirm that print exposure can not only predict but also contribute to growth in the domain of literacy skills.

2.1.2. Reading Achievement

Not all studies, however, are so confident about making such connections. Nell (1988) finds that "there is very little empirical evidence that relates reading ability to reading habits." (p. 9) He does examine studies that provide indirect and anecdotal evidence that there is a strong co-occurrance of reading skill and recreational reading; more often than not, however, the evidence seems to suggest that greater reading ability leads to more recreational reading, and not the other way around. He conducted his own study of 129 South African university students and 33 "ludic readers" (subjects who read extensively for their own pleasure) of varying ages. Nell hypothesized that reading comprehension speed would be positively associated with both quantity of books read and time spent in reading books for pleasure, but not with newspaper and magazine reading. By testing reading comprehension speed, and surveying ludic reading habits through a questionnaire, he did find strong support for this hypothesis, but cautions that no causal inferences can be drawn from this information.

Krashen (2004) interprets the myriad studies he examines as evidence that time spent reading books is associated with superior reading skills. For example, he quotes Anderson, Wilson and Fielding as saying that "among all the ways children spend their time, reading books was the best predictor of several measures of reading achievement" (p. 8). Other researchers have supported Krashen's findings: Flowers (2003) found that among African-American students, reading for pleasure was strongly associated with scores on standardized reading achievement tests.

In one interesting study that might provide more direct evidence for the power of recreational reading to positively impact reading skill, Beglar et al. (2012) compared 80 Japanese ESL students whose classes required mostly self-chosen pleasure reading, including monitored extra-curricular reading, with 17 students

whose classes consisted mostly of intensive direct reading instruction. The pleasure readers made much greater gains in reading rate, with no discernible loss of reading comprehension, as measured by a 32-item reading rate test. The authors equate this with a gain in "reading fluency." This could suggest more directly that pleasure reading contributes to reading fluency in ways that reading instruction does not.

2.1.3. Writing Achievement

Krashen (2004) believes that extensive recreational reading leads to gains in writing achievement. In the studies he examined, frequent readers tended to be better spellers and to have a firmer grasp of grammar. For example, in one study of Spanish students, the subjects' amount of recreational reading was the only predictor of their ability to correctly use the Spanish subjunctive; a study of ESL learners in the United States and their ability to use the relative clause in English had similar findings. Another study showed that "each time readers read a passage containing words they cannot spell, they make a small amount of progress in acquiring the correct spelling." (Krashen, 2004, p. 16)

2.1.4. Vocabulary

In one famous study, students read the novel *A Clockwork Orange*, a book written in an invented dialect filled with many words that do not exist in standard English. When later tested on the vocabulary from the novel, students demonstrated that by simply reading the words in context, they had learned the words and their meanings (Krashen, 2004). Krashen concludes that this demonstrates a direct causal relationship between reading fiction and vocabulary growth.

Cullinan (2000) compiles a number of studies that conclude that recreational reading is a positive contributor to vocabulary growth:

> [S]tudents in grades 3–12 learn about 3,000 new words a year…. [They] acquire knowledge of some vocabulary words as the result of direct instruction, but that could only account for a modest proportion of the total. To learn 3,000 words a year would require learning about fifteen words every school day–more than even the most enthusiastic teacher would attempt to teach. Vocabulary is learned from reading. (p. 7)

2.1.5. Overall Academic Achievement

The findings concerning associations between recreational reading and overall academic achievement are varied and mostly inconclusive. For example, Galik (1999) conducted a study in which she surveyed 139 freshman and upper-level writing students at a private liberal arts college. She found an insignificant (r = .08) correlation between cumulative GPA and recreational reading during school sessions, and a "weak but statistically significant" correlation between GPA and holiday recreational reading. Her conclusion? "Pleasure reading in itself is not a strong predictor of achievement in college." (p. 486) She found no important differences between reading habits of average students, students with learning disabilities, and Honours students, further suggesting that it may not be possible to draw connections between the amount of recreational reading students do and their achievement in school.

Moje et al. (2008) had similar results, but with one important difference. They conducted a large and complex study to examine and challenge preconceptions about how much adolescents read, what motivates them to read, and what impact this reading may have on their lives, particularly their school achievement. Two samples (Wave 1: 329 students, and Wave 2: 716 students) were drawn from middle schools in a mostly Latino neighbourhood of a large American city. The researchers

operationalized time spent reading for pleasure by first a seven-tiered and then a three-tiered Likert-type scale. They used a variety of instruments to represent students' literacy practices, attitudes and achievements: computer-based surveys, interviews, observations, and school records. They operationalized their dependent variable, school achievement, as overall cumulative GPA as well as grades in specific subject areas. Of all literacy activities participants engaged in, only novel reading associated positively to increased academic achievement. This raises some interesting questions about whether fiction reading has effects on literacy skill that other types of reading do not.

2.2. Is Fiction Reading Associated with Cognitive Skills that Contribute to Literacy Achievement?

Some interesting recent research explores other cognitive skills that may, directly or indirectly, impact achievement on literacy tests. Studies of these skills focus particularly on the reading of fiction. Djikic et al. (2013) found that reading a literary short story created a short-term reduction in subjects' need for "cognitive closure." They operationalized "literary texts" as short fiction; in their study, they chose early-20th-century stories from anthologies, and used nonfiction essays as control texts. They defined "cognitive closure" as a need to arrive at solutions quickly and avoid ambiguity; they describe subjects who need cognitive closure as "seizing" on a possible conclusion and then "freezing" on that conclusion, even when complicating or contradictory information is introduced. The authors explain that this need for cognitive closure has a detrimental effect on an individual's critical and rational thinking abilities. The authors operationalized the construct of "cognitive closure" through the Need for Closure Scale, a self-reporting questionnaire with 42 items measuring such characteristics as preference for order, predictability and close-mindedness. This scale has been successfully tested for convergent and discriminant validity, and has a Cronbach's alpha reliability estimate of .84. A number of controls were put into place to further ensure the validity and reliability of the data collected.

The sample was of one hundred University of Toronto students, both native and non-native speakers of English, who responded voluntarily to recruitment posters. The researchers found that reading a short story did indeed diminish, in the short term (that is, immediately following the experiment), a participant's need for cognitive closure, and more so than reading an essay, but the effect was not the same for everyone: habitual frequent readers (of either fiction or nonfiction) experienced this effect more strongly than other participants. The authors propose that further research is needed to reveal whether such diminished need for closure is sustained over the long term or might even be cumulative. If frequent reading makes us more susceptible to relinquishing our need for cognitive closure, it may be an important ingredient in developing a flexibility of mind that can lead to advanced literacy skills such as logically organized thought, the ability to substantiate and revise arguments based on evidence, and so forth.

Ross (2000) reports that "heavy readers" are able to identify with fictional stories that bear little obvious similarity to their own lives, while non-readers have difficulty making connections between their own experience and fictional ones. She conducted a qualitative interview-based study of 194 adult "heavy readers," and found from previous research that infrequent readers "seem not to make a connection between the book in front of them and the text of their own life" (p. 5) This speaks to a larger psychological concept, that of Theory of Mind, the mechanism through which we are able to interpret and predict the thoughts and feelings of others through their words and behaviours (Marraffa). The activity of literary analysis requires this capacity: students who are less cognitively advanced often have difficulty separating their own emotional and personal responses to texts from the ideas and techniques authors are employing, and have difficulty analyzing literary characters because they find their behaviours "weird" or immoral. According to Ross's study, students who read a great deal may be better equipped to understand and analyze the words, thoughts and behaviours of others, whether it be in an argument or in a fictional world.

However, Ross obliquely raises a concern about this. “Unlike literary critics who deconstruct the notion of character and prefer the distanced contemplation of the aesthetic signifier, most pleasure readers expect books to represent characters…whose lives offer models for living.” (p. 7) Gilbert and Fister (2011) present this question more explicitly: they wonder whether recreational reading of fiction may actually *interfere* with critical and analytical skills:

> Critical reading requires avoiding being absorbed in a story…if that emotional involvement inhibits analysis. As one English professor put it, students need to learn that reading, *which may seem effortless* [my emphasis], is actually quite difficult. Students’ enjoyment in reading literature, he reported, “…created a kind of ‘transparency effect’…, preventing students from getting very far toward reading in deliberate and self-conscious ways.” …A goal of his teaching is to turn naïve readers into sophisticated ones, learning to go beyond discussing the story to focus on how the story works. (p. 475)

This might suggest that students who do not already have “ingrained reading practices” could be at an advantage! These students often do not find reading “effortless,” as more habitual readers do, and thus might find it easier to take a critical distance.

2.3. How Much Recreational Reading Do Adolescents Do?

Looking chronologically at surveys of young people’s recreational reading habits would ideally give us some sense of whether large changes have occurred in this phenomenon, but the reality is more complicated; most studies are small and target a specific population (a private liberal arts college or a large public university, for example), and so the conclusions drawn by researchers are difficult to generalize. If we begin in 1991, a survey of 300 liberal-arts college seniors from a single school found that 88% read for pleasure regularly (Gilbert & Fister, 2011). However, in

Galik's (1999) survey at a similar school a few years later, 63% of the 139 students she surveyed reported less than 2 hours per week of recreational reading during the school session, and 48% said that they read less than 2 hours per week during the holidays; only 13% reported 6 or more hours per week of school-session pleasure reading, and only 25% reported reading recreationally for 6 or more hours per week when school was out. Seventy-six percent said that they would read more if they had time, but this was not borne out by the holiday reading statistic. Given the size and specificity of these samples, it is difficult to draw meaningful conclusions, but the fact that the populations surveyed were similar suggests that there may be something to be learned from the change in results over time.

Many studies demonstrate that most young people do *some* recreational reading. In Burak's 2004 survey of 201 students, 63% reported reading a book for enjoyment during the semester (Gilbert & Fister, 2011); Howard (2004) found that 84% of Nova Scotia teenagers surveyed read at least one book a year for fun. (Whether reading one book per semester or per year for fun constitutes a strong recreational reading habit is of course open to discussion.) Hopper (2005) surveyed a convenience sample of 707 mostly 11-to-15-year-olds about their reading habits in 2002, and discovered that 61% were reading a book for fun during the week of the study; in her analysis of all her data about the participants and their reading, she concluded that "there has been no significant decline in adolescent habits of reading fiction compared with previous studies" (p. 117). Hari and Joliffe conducted a 2008 survey in which they determined that public university students averaged 25 minutes per day in recreational print reading and about 50 minutes per day reading online sources (Gilbert & Fister, 2011). In a 2009 survey, 539 students demonstrated that, although internet use was more popular than print reading, it did not decrease print reading time (Gilbert & Fister, 2011).

In Gilbert and Fister's 2009 study of 717 undergraduate students at small liberal arts college, 93% of participants reported enjoying reading, but results were quite different according to program. For example, 99% of humanities majors – the program with the highest percentage - said that they liked to read for entertainment; the lowest result was for pre-professional and social science majors, at 90%. The most popular genre for recreational reading was general fiction, followed by mysteries, classics and nonfiction. Very little recreational reading was done during the school year, although 1 in 5 humanities majors reported reading recreationally for 3 or more hours per week. Almost 50% of pre-professionals and fine arts students, 1 out of 3 natural science and social science majors, and 1 out of 5 humanities majors read for less than 1 hour per week during the school session; the primary obstacle to reading for recreation was cited as a lack of time. The researchers concluded that

> college students enjoy reading for pleasure to a far greater degree than previous reports would indicate….Clearly, our students feel the reading they do for classes competes with voluntary reading, but their enjoyment in reading and their expressed desire to read material of their own choosing indicates that reading is, in fact, thriving. (p. 490)

All these studies offer food for thought, but perhaps the most important observation to be made is that none target a population with the characteristics of Vanier College, a CEGEP with a hugely diverse population in terms of academic achievement, linguistic and cultural background, and socioeconomic status. This points to a need to survey our students directly about their recreational reading habits, as previous studies give us little data that we can generalize to the particularities of our student body.

3. CONCLUSION AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Despite valiant and sometimes opinionated struggles to establish links between recreational reading and literacy skill, researchers have yet to formulate any clear conclusions. As teachers, we make certain assumptions about how much students read recreationally, what kinds of texts they read, and how this reading (or lack thereof) affects their literacy skill, without having much in the way of direct evidence.

It would be useful for Vanier College teachers to have data about the fiction-reading backgrounds and habits, as well as their enjoyment of and desire to read fiction, of the particular students entering our classrooms, and about any, even tentative, associations between those reading backgrounds and the literacy skills they display. If Gladwell's (2008) assertion is true – that 10,000 hours of practice is the minimum requirement for real expertise – then knowing how far our students fall short of that is essential information: we may not wish for our students to become world-class experts in reading necessarily, but many of the studies above suggest that the more time we spend reading, the more expert we will become, not only at reading but at writing, at thinking, and at navigating many of our personal, professional and academic challenges. Although we can try to explicitly teach our students plenty of ways to tackle language, composition and literature, if they are avid readers, they will learn these skills at least partly without our help, and will continue to develop them when they leave us.

Such knowledge would be a starting point for a truly Constructivist college English studies curriculum. If we want to build strong scaffolds in order to bring our students to where we would like them to be, we need to start where they are: we can't do that if we don't know where that is.

Therefore, my study addressed the following research questions and hypotheses:

3.1. Primary Research Question

> For Vanier College students in English 101 classes, to what extent are *quantity* and *frequency* of *recreational reading* of *long-form fiction* positively associated with *literacy achievement* in English?

3.2. Secondary Research Question

As the study progressed, in addition to variables of quantity and frequency of recreational long-form fiction reading, a third and fourth variable presented themselves: reported enjoyment of reading long-form fiction and reported desire to read long-form fiction if only time allowed. These new, unexpected findings led to the creation of an additional research question:

> For Vanier College students in English 101 classes, to what extent is enjoyment of reading long-form fiction, and desire to do so, positively associated with literacy achievement in English?

3.3. Hypotheses

The research questions lead to the following hypotheses:

1. Quantity of recreational reading of long-form fiction is positively associated with literacy achievement in English.
2. Frequency of recreational reading of long-form fiction is positively associated with literacy achievement in English.

3. Enjoyment of recreational reading of long-form fiction is positively associated with literacy achievement in English.
4. Desire to read long-form fiction is positively associated with literacy achievement in English.

3.5. Definitions of Main Constructs

3.5.1. Recreational Reading: For the purposes of this study, “recreational reading” is reading undertaken voluntarily for personal enjoyment, and not for school, work or other mandatory assignments.

3.5.2. Quantity/Frequency/Enjoyment/Desired Frequency:

1. “Quantity” refers to the number of books of fiction read for enjoyment per year. This included print and electronic books. ("Books" are works of fiction of at least 100 pages);
2. “Frequency” refers to the average number of hours spent reading fiction for enjoyment;
3. "Enjoyment" refers to the degree to which the student self-identified as "liking" books, fiction or other kinds of texts;
4. "Desired frequency" refers to the number of hours the student said they would want to spend reading books of fiction if their free time was unlimited.

3.5.3. Fiction: “Fiction” is imaginative narrative writing. Nonfiction narrative writing (such as memoirs) has many of the same characteristics of fictional narrative, and could easily have been included, but limiting the study to fiction has made it more manageable, and the literature reviewed above points to a number of reasons that fiction may be a particularly interesting genre where literacy skills are concerned.

3.5.4. Long-form: "Long-form" was defined in this study as any written work of 100 or more pages. A long-form work of fiction, for example, is a novel.

3.5.5. Literacy Skills: These skills include levels of facility with a) reading comprehension and insight, b) logical written organization, and c) accurate written expression in English (including recognition of sentence-level errors), as measured by the Vanier College Placement Test and as further diagnosed by first-week writing samples in English 101 classes.

CHAPTER FOUR: METHODOLOGY

1. INTRODUCTION

My method has involved a correlational approach, as the goal has been to determine whether there is any association between literacy achievement and the quantity, frequency, enjoyment, and desired frequency of recreational reading of long-form fiction. Specific methods have included:

1. *Survey Method:* This was the primary method. English 101 students were surveyed regarding their recreational reading habits, as well as their attitudes toward reading fiction (whether they enjoy reading fiction and would like to do more of it). This was the simplest way to quickly gather data on how much, how often, and what they read, as well as how much they would like to, and to organize the data into ordinal ranks. It also provided an opportunity to gather important demographic information like mother tongue and language of high school study, and to ask some open-ended questions about their family of origin's reading habits and attitudes toward reading. The quantitative data was analyzed numerically, while the open-ended questions were coded and themes were extrapolated;
2. *Analysis of Numerical Data and Content Analysis of Performance Assessment (Placement Test):* The performance assessment had already been carried out through the Vanier College Placement Test, which ranks students according to literacy ability and uses this information to place them in English 101-MA, MB or MC classes. (Adjustments to this placement level may have been made in some cases by students' English teachers during the first week of classes, based on an in-class diagnostic test designed by individual teachers.) Some

analysis of numerical data and content analysis of the test was carried out when examining particular interesting cases.

2. POPULATION AND SAMPLING

2.1. Population and Type of Sample

The population was English 101 students enrolled in the fall semester of 2016. Most of these students were incoming first-year students (92% of students surveyed indicated that this was their first semester attending Vanier College). The sample was a convenience sample based on English 101 teachers' willingness to let me visit their classes to survey students, and the compatibility of my and their timetables.

I surveyed students in ten English 101 classes: three 101-MA (non-remedial) sections, four 101-MB (first-tier remedial level) sections, and three 101-MC (second-tier remedial level) sections. These numbers of sections (3, 4 and 3) were chosen to reflect the overall population of the college, and to reflect the number of sections of each type of course that are generally offered (the largest proportion of our students is usually placed in 101-MB courses). The questionnaire was completed by 267 participants; respondents included 113 MA students, 105 MB and 49 MC students. The small number of MC students is due to two factors; MC classes are smaller than other 101 classes, and a larger proportion of MC students chose not to participate in the study than in other levels. The smaller number of MC students may have compromised the statistical significance of certain results.

2.2. Description of Sample

The population of Vanier College is specific in a number of ways. For example, the mother-tongue background of the students surveyed was widely diverse.

Of the students surveyed, 36% identified English as their mother tongue, 12% said French is their mother tongue, 31% identified another language as their mother tongue, and 21% have spoken 2 or more languages since birth. Of those who speak a single mother tongue other than English or French, the largest percentages are of South Asian languages (Urdu, Tamil, Punjabi, Hindi, Pashto and Bangla, 23%), Chinese languages (Cantonese, Mandarin and "Chinese", 11%), and Greek (11%). Also well represented were Arabic (9%) and Spanish (7%). Of those who claimed to have two mother tongues, the greatest proportion (16%) have spoken English and French since birth, but a fair number claim English and Spanish (11%) and English and Italian (9%) as their mother tongues. Students who claimed more than one mother tongue represented a total of 30 variations, including such combinations as English and Turkish, French and Kabyle, and English, Urdu and Persian.

As might be expected, results for the question regarding mother tongue varied by cohort.

Table 1a
101-MA: Mother Tongue

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	**English**	46	**40.7**	40.7	40.7
	French	14	**12.4**	12.4	53.1
	Other	31	**27.4**	27.4	80.5
	2 or more	22	**19.5**	19.5	100.0
	Total	113	100.0	100.0	

Table 1b
101-MB: Mother Tongue

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	**English**	42	**40.0**	40.0	40.0
	French	11	**10.5**	10.5	50.5
	Other	33	**31.4**	31.4	81.9
	2 or more	19	**18.1**	18.1	100.0
	Total	105	100.0	100.0	

Table 1c
101-MC: Mother Tongue

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	**English**	8	**16.3**	16.3	16.3
	French	8	**16.3**	16.3	32.7
	Other	19	**38.8**	38.8	71.4
	2 or more	14	**28.6**	28.6	100.0
	Total	49	100.0	100.0	

Tables 1a, 1b and 1c demonstrate that 41% of MA students, 40% of MB students and 16% of MC students reported English as their mother tongue. The proportion of students who reported that their first language was neither English nor French was larger for 101-MC students (39%) than for MA (27%) or MB (31%) students. What is more, a much larger percentage of MC students (29%) than MA (20%) or MB (18%) students reported that they had spoken two or more languages from birth.

Students were also asked what language they primarily speak at home. 42% of students said they mostly speak English, 9% speak French, 17% speak a language other than English or French, and 31% speak more than one language at home. Of

those who speak a single language other than English or French at home, the largest percentage speak Spanish (18%), followed by Arabic (14%) and Russian (11%). Seventeen languages were represented. Of those who speak 2 or more languages at home, 13% speak English and French, 10% speak English and Greek, and 6% speak English and Italian, English and Tamil, or French and Arabic. Students in this category claimed 35 different combinations of home languages, including such pairings as French and Pashto or German and Vietnamese, and more elaborate variations such as English, French, Bengali and Hindi; or English, French, Spanish and Greek.

Again, these proportions were not consistent across cohorts.

Table 2a
101-MA: Language Spoken at Home

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	**English**	59	**52.2**	52.2	52.2
	French	8	**7.1**	7.1	59.3
	Other	20	**17.7**	17.7	77.0
	2 or more	26	**23.0**	23.0	100.0
	Total	113	100.0	100.0	

Table 2b
101-MB: Language Spoken at Home

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	**English**	45	**42.9**	42.9	42.9
	French	11	**10.5**	10.5	53.3
	Other	15	**14.3**	14.3	67.6
	2 or more	34	**32.4**	32.4	100.0
	Total	105	100.0	100.0	

Table 2c
101-MC: Language Spoken at Home

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	**English**	9	**18.4**	18.4	18.4
	French	6	**12.2**	12.2	30.6
	Other	11	**22.4**	22.4	53.1
	2 or more	23	**46.9**	46.9	100.0
	Total	49	100.0	100.0	

As can be seen in Tables 2a, 2b and 2c, 52% of 101-MA students, 43% of MB students and 18% of MC students identified English as their primary language at home. MC students were much more likely (47%) than MA (23%) or MB (32%) students to speak two or more languages at home.

Students also varied in terms of their primary language of high school study (see Figure 7). Of the students surveyed, 35% studied primarily in English in high school, 44% studied in French, and 17% went to bilingual schools. Five percent studied in a language other than English or French; 10 languages or combinations of languages were represented here, including Armenian, Russian, Arabic, Farsi and more.

In this case, the cohorts showed one important difference.

Table 3a
101-MA: Language of High School Study

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	English	44	38.9	38.9	38.9
	French	52	46.0	46.0	85.0
	Bilingual	15	13.3	13.3	98.2
	Other	2	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	113	100.0	100.0	

Table 3b
101-MB: Language of High School Study

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	English	42	40.0	40.0	40.0
	French	39	37.1	37.1	77.1
	Bilingual	20	19.0	19.0	96.2
	Other	4	3.8	3.8	100.0
	Total	105	100.0	100.0	

Table 3c
101-MC: Language of High School Study

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	English	7	14.3	14.3	14.3
	French	26	53.1	53.1	67.3
	Bilingual	10	20.4	20.4	87.8
	Other	6	12.2	12.2	100.0
	Total	49	100.0	100.0	

Tables 3a, 3b and 3c show that MA and MB students were almost three times as likely as MC students to have studied primarily in English in high school (39%,

40% and 14% respectively); 53% of MC students attended a French high school, 20% attended a French/English bilingual school, and 12% studied in another language.

Almost all participants (94%) were between 16 and 19 years old; 68% were 17.

3. DATA COLLECTION AND INSTRUMENTATION

3.1. Survey Questionnaire

Given the particular parameters of this project and the specificity of the Vanier College population, I developed the questionnaire (see Appendix A) myself. It includes demographic questions (see Section 2.1); multiple-choice questions (including some Likert-type-scale questions) in which students identified their reading habits, reading preferences, and attitudes toward reading, specifically reading fiction, and ranked their recreational fiction-reading in terms of *quantity*, *frequency, enjoyment* and *desired frequency*; and some open-ended questions on reading habits and attitudes toward reading in the student's family of origin. Prior to the administration of the survey to 101 students, the questionnaire was repeatedly revised in response to feedback from the Vanier Research Ethics Board. The survey was then piloted in two Research Methodology classes at Vanier, and small adjustments were made in response to student feedback.

The variables measured by the questionnaire are:

1. *Degree of Enjoyment of Recreational Book Reading:* This was measured on a nominal Likert-type scale, indicating how much a student enjoys reading books in their free time. Four responses were possible: a) Yes! b) Sometimes, c) Rarely, and d) No! This data was analyzed nominally;

2. *Kinds of Books Enjoyed:* Students were given six choices in this category, and asked to choose as many as apply to them: fiction, personal narrative, other non-fiction, poetry, other (precision was requested), and "I don't like reading any kind of book". This data was analyzed nominally;

3. *Other Kinds of Texts Enjoyed:* Students were given seven choices in this category, and asked to choose as many as apply: print newspapers, print magazines, online journalism, blogs, comics (other than book-length), other (precision was requested), and "I don't really like reading any kind of text." This data was analyzed nominally;

4. *Quantity of Recreational Reading of Fiction:* This was measured on an ordinal Likert-type scale, indicating number of books of fiction, not assigned in school or other mandatory contexts, read in the past twelve months. The variable was measured in the following increments: a) None (0); b) Not many (1-3); c) A few (4-6), d) A fair number (7-9), and e) Lots! (10 or more; precision was requested). For the purposes of tabulation, these were converted into an ordinal ranking of non-equal intervals: 1 = zero, 2 = small quantity, 3 = moderate quantity, 4 = large quantity, and 5 = very large quantity;

5. *Frequency of Recreational Reading of Fiction:* This was also measured on an ordinal Likert-type scale, indicating approximate average number of hours spent in recreational reading of fiction books over the past twelve months. The variable was measured in the following increments: a) No time (0 hours); b) Very little time (more than 0 hours but less than 1 hour per week); c) Little time (more than 1 hour but less than 2 hours per week); d) A fair amount of time (more than 2 hours but less than 4 hours per week) and e) A lot of time (more than 4 hours per week; precision was requested). For the purposes of

tabulation, these were converted into an ordinal ranking of non-equal intervals: 1 = zero, 2 = low frequency, 3 = moderate frequency, 4 = high frequency and 5 = very high frequency;

6. *Desired Frequency of Recreational Reading of Fiction:* In order to address the many factors that may inhibit high school and college students from investing time in recreational reading, students were also asked to identify how much time they would spend reading fiction if they had as much free reading time as they would like. This was also measured on an ordinal Likert-type scale, indicating approximate average number of hours they would like to spend reading per week. The variable was measured in the following increments: a) No time (0 hours); b) Very little time (more than 0 hours but less than 1 hour per week); c) Little time (more than 1 hour but less than 2 hours per week); d) A fair amount of time (more than 2 hours but less than 4 hours per week) and e) A lot of time (more than 4 hours per week; precision was requested). For the purposes of tabulation, these were converted into an ordinal ranking of non-equal intervals: 1 = zero, 2 = low frequency, 3 = moderate frequency, 4 = high frequency and 5 = very high frequency;

7. *Reading Habits and Attitudes Toward Reading in Family of Origin:* Some open-ended questions were asked about the reading habits of the family of origin and exposure to print material in the home. These included questions on parents' enjoyment of reading and tendency to read for fun, whether there were "a lot" of books in the student's home and whether they included "a lot" of fiction, what other activities the family valued if reading was not prioritized, and whether the student's reading habits resembled those of their family. The content of these responses was coded and themes were extrapolated. These responses also formed the basis upon which some interesting case studies were chosen for further examination.

3.2. Diagnostic Test: Ranking and Content Analysis to Measure Literacy Achievement

Before being surveyed, the students had been placed in 101 courses based on their results on the Vanier College Placement Test. The ordinal rankings of this test are as follows:

1. Preparation for College English (very poor English literacy achievement; grade on test = 0-40/100) (no Prep students were included in this study);
2. 101-MC (inadequate English literacy achievement, second tier; grade on test = 41-55/100);
3. 101-MB (inadequate English literacy achievement, first tier; grade on test = 56-70/100);
4. 101-MA (adequate to high literacy achievement; grade on test = 70-100/100).

The Placement Test consists of 62 multiple-choice questions and one long-form written response. The multiple-choice questions include recognition of correct usage of and errors in grammar (including verb tense and form, articles, possessives, prepositions, plurals, and pronouns), sentence structure (including comma splices, run-on sentences, sentence fragments, and use of coordinating and subordinating conjunctions), spelling, vocabulary, punctuation, and capitalization. There are also multiple-choice analytical responses in which students must read several poems and several short stories and demonstrate comprehension of these texts, in part by identifying themes explored and literary techniques used in the works. The long-form response is an analytical response to a short story, which also involves demonstrating comprehension, mostly by identifying a theme and explaining how the author

communicates it through the use of literary devices. (It was not possible to include the test as an appendix to this paper for confidentiality and procedural reasons, as many sections of the test are retained for repeated use.) The student's grade for the test is generated automatically based on the multiple-choice responses, but grades are verified by the English Department Placement Coordinator based on the long-form response, and placement levels are sometimes changed as a result. English teachers also administer a diagnostic test on the first day of the semester in order to verify that all Prep and 101 students have been placed in the correct level, and changes are made if necessary.

The test is meant to determine general literacy levels, but the rankings are in some ways ambiguous. Because a large part of the Placement Test grade is based on raw grammatical competency, students with strong overall literacy skills are sometimes placed in Prep or MC, because their mastery of comprehension, analysis and composition is counterbalanced by their language errors (this can be true of foreign university graduates who have recently arrived in the country, for example.) Also, because the Placement Test is now administered online, technical problems can sometimes result in artificially low grades. Also, students have more opportunities to cheat on these tests (and apparently sometimes do, for reasons that are unclear!) and, according to the Placement Coordinator, sometimes students deliberately do poorly in order to avoid being placed in a more challenging English courses. For these reasons, the survey questionnaires for this study were administered a few weeks into the semester, so that students who had been identified by their teachers as misplaced in their level had had the opportunity to be moved to a level that more appropriately reflected their literacy skills.

Another ambiguity is in the broad range of literacy level encompassed by the MA ranking: some MA students show barely adequate literacy competence, while others are highly accomplished. Therefore, when asking students' consent before

administering their surveys, I also asked for permission to look at their Placement Test, including the written response portion, in order to do some content analysis if required.

Prep students were excluded from this study for two reasons: a) prep students are outliers because of their very weak language skills, often as a result of limited exposure to English, and b) at the time students were surveyed, the author of this study was the only Prep teacher, and this raised ethical concerns where data collection and confidentiality were concerned.

4. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Approval for the research was granted by the Vanier College Ethics Board (see Appendix C). All students were debriefed on the nature of the study and asked to sign consent forms (see Appendix B: "Consent Form Including Debriefing Statement") allowing me to use their survey answers and access their Placement Tests. Students were assured that although the surveys were not anonymous - student ID numbers were required on surveys to allow access to Placement Tests - they were confidential: only the researcher has had access to their surveys, and their names have not been attached to or used in any documents used in this study, including the surveys or this paper. Students ID numbers were not included in any data analysis documents; a separate Excel document was created associating student ID numbers to data ID numbers that were used in the SPSS data document. For reasons of confidentiality, I did not include my own classes in this study. I will keep all paper questionnaires, consent forms and interview transcripts until at least one year after the study and Master's paper are complete. Compiled and analyzed data will be stored for at least one year after the study as SPSS files.

5. PROCEDURES: TIMETABLE

May 2015-March 2016: The proposal was submitted to Université de Sherbrooke and the Vanier College Ethics Board and received approval.

April 2016: The proposal was submitted to the Vanier College English Department and received approval.

August 2016: English 101 teachers were asked for their collaboration in allowing me to visit their classes to administer the questionnaire.

September-October 2016: I visited 3 classes each of English 101-MA and 101-MC, and 4 classes of 101-MB, over the course of 3 weeks. I administered the questionnaire and asked students to complete a consent form, asking them for permission not only to use their data but also to access their placement tests. Students were assured of confidentiality.

October 2016-February 2017: Data analysis was performed in order to see if there are simple associations between recreational fiction-reading habits and course placement level, as well as attitudes toward reading fiction and placement level. The questionnaire responses were also consulted in order to identify 1. students placed in 101-MA courses (highest literacy level) who claim to do little recreational fiction reading, 2. students placed in lower-level courses who claim to do a lot of recreational fiction reading, and 3. students whose answers to the open-ended questions suggested other, more qualitative, anomalies or points of interest where the data was concerned. These students' placement test writing samples were examined and coded to determine

whether their course placement is an accurate reflection of their literacy level, and some case studies were generated for consideration.

March 2017-August 2018: The final Masters paper was written and submitted.

6. DATA ANALYSIS

Quantitative data concerning the association between literacy achievement and recreational fiction reading was cross-tabulated in SPSS. Tables were produced in order to examine the relationships between literacy achievement, as measured by a student's English 101 course placement, and the following variables (presented on the questionnaire in the following order):

1. The student's reported enjoyment of reading books;
2. Types of books the student reported enjoying;
3. The student's reported enjoyment of reading other texts;
4. The language in which the student's recreational reading most often took place;
5. The student's reported:
    A. quantity;
    B. frequency; and
    C. desired frequency of recreational long-form fiction (novel) reading; and,
6. Print exposure, reading habits, and attitudes toward reading in the student's family of origin.

A Chi-square test for independence was conducted for each cross-tabulation to determine whether the null hypothesis (that there is no relationship between recreational fiction reading and literacy achievement) could be accepted or rejected; that is, to determine whether any observed relationships between fiction-reading habits, as well as attitudes toward reading fiction, and literacy levels were statistically significant (or instead possibly due to chance.)

CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to obtain information about students' recreational long-form fiction-reading habits, as well as their attitudes around recreational long-form fiction reading, and to determine whether there was any association between those variables and students' literacy levels, as determined by their placement in their English 101 courses. Overall, the data collected through student surveys indicated some association between these variables, although the most interesting data was complex and nuanced, and indicated a need to take a closer look at myriad factors that might or might not affect a student's literacy level.

2. RECREATIONAL READING HABITS AND ATTITUDES TOWARD READING

2.1. Do You Like to Read Books?

For the overall sample population, the claims about liking or not liking to read books were fairly evenly split.

Table 4

"Do you like to read books in your spare time for fun?"

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	**Yes**	61	22.8	**23.1**	23.1
	Sometimes	74	27.7	**28.0**	51.1
	Rarely	80	30.0	**30.3**	81.4
	No	49	18.4	**18.6**	100.0
	Total	264	98.9	100.0	
Missing	99.00	3	1.1		
Total		267	100.0		

Table 4 shows that the greatest proportion of students surveyed (30%) claimed to "rarely" like to read books, but 23% claimed that yes, they do like reading books for fun. Only 19% claimed to not like reading books at all. However, there was a difference when the sample was split by cohort.

Table 5

"Do you like to read books in your spare time for fun?": By Cohort

		Yes	**Sometimes**	**Rarely**	**No**	**Total**
MA	Count	31	28	41	12	112
	% within 101 Level	**27.7%**	**25.0%**	**36.6%**	**10.7%**	100.0%
	% within Likes Books	50.8%	37.8%	51.3%	24.5%	42.4%
	% of Total	11.7%	10.6%	15.5%	4.5%	42.4%
MB	Count	20	32	26	26	104
	% within 101 Level	**19.2%**	**30.8%**	**25.0%**	**25.0%**	100.0%
	% within Likes Books	32.8%	43.2%	32.5%	53.1%	39.4%
	% of Total	7.6%	12.1%	9.8%	9.8%	39.4%
MC	Count	10	14	13	11	48
	% within 101 Level	**20.8%**	**29.2%**	**27.1%**	**22.9%**	100.0%
	% within Likes Books	16.4%	18.9%	16.3%	22.4%	18.2%
	% of Total	3.8%	5.3%	4.9%	4.2%	18.2%

According to Table 5, of students placed in non-remedial (101-MA) English, 27.7% say that they unequivocally like reading books, and 25% say they like reading books sometimes. In the first-tier remedial level (101-MB), these numbers are 19.2% and 30.8%, and in the second-tier remedial level (101-MC), they are 20.8% and 29.2%.

Therefore, the percentage of non-remedial students who say that yes, they like reading books, is higher (27.7%) than in either of the remedial levels; there is little difference between the number of MB and MC students who enjoy reading books (19.2% for MB and 20.8% for MC). If we expand that number to include both those who unequivocally like to read books and those who like to read books "sometimes", the gap is smaller:

MA: 52.2%

MB: 49.5%

MC: 49%

A more notable gap occurs if we compare numbers of students who say no, they do not like to read books at all:

MA: 10.6%

MB: 24.8%

MC: 22.4%

It therefore seems that, within this sample, there is an association between the variables of literacy level, as measured by 101 course placement, and enjoyment of reading books. However, $p = 0.063$ suggests weak evidence for the relationship.

2.2. What Kinds of Books Do You Like to Read?

When asked what kinds of books they like to read, 79% of 101 students responded that they like fiction (regardless of whether they like to read books or not!). 28% said they like to read personal narrative, 29% like to read other kinds of non-fiction, 7% like to read poetry, and 6% said they like to read other kinds of books (short stories; religious books; manga, comic collections or graphic novels; self-help; and humour/comedy were specified). In the overall sample, 11% said they do not like any sort of book.

If we analyze the cohorts separately, some differences appear.

Table 6
"Do you like to read fiction?": By Cohort

		No	Yes	Total
MA	Count	14	99	113
	% within 101 Level	**12.4%**	**87.6%**	100.0%
	% within Likes Fiction	25.0%	46.9%	42.3%
	% of Total	5.2%	37.1%	42.3%
MB	Count	25	80	105
	% within 101 Level	**23.8%**	**76.2%**	100.0%
	% within Likes Fiction	44.6%	37.9%	39.3%
	% of Total	9.4%	30.0%	39.3%
MC	Count	17	32	49
	% within 101 Level	**34.7%**	**65.3%**	100.0%
	% within Likes Fiction	30.4%	15.2%	18.4%
	% of Total	6.4%	12.0%	18.4%

According to Table 6, 88% of MA (non-remedial) students say that they like to read books of fiction, as compared to 76% of MB students and 65% of MC students. The table clearly shows that there is an association between the 101 levels and the variable "do you like reading fiction?" This observed association is

statistically significant ($p < 0.01; p = 0.004$). According to this sample, 101 students who are found to have adequate college-level literacy skills are more likely to already enjoy reading fiction than those who need remedial help.

When students were asked whether they liked to read other kinds of books, the results showed few consistent associations. (See Appendix D for tables.) However, MC students were materially more likely than other students to say that they enjoy reading personal narratives (35%, vs. 27% of MA students and 25% of MB students; see Table 16a) and other nonfiction (41%, vs. 31% of MA students and 20% of MB students; see Table 16b). MC and MB students chose "I do not like reading any kind of book" twice as often as MA students (MA: 7%; MB: 13%; MC: 14%; see Table 16c).

2.3. What Else Do You Like to Read?

The questionnaire included questions about texts other than books that students like to read. The purpose of these questions was to explore whether reading in general, and not just recreational reading of long-form fiction, might be associated with higher literacy levels.

Aside from books, 23% of students surveyed said that they like to read print newspapers; 30% like to read print magazines; 51% said they like to read online newspapers, magazines and other journalism; 36% like to read blogs; 36% like to read comics; and 10% said that they do not like reading any sort of text.

There were some differences between the cohorts. For example, 38% of MC (second-tier remedial) students say they like to read print newspapers, as opposed to 23% of MA (non-remedial) and 15% of MB (first-tier remedial) students (see

Appendix D for all relevant tables). MB (32.4%) and MC (30.6%) students were more likely than MA (28.3%) students to enjoy reading print magazines; MA (55.8%) and MC (53.1%) students were more likely than MB (44.8%) students to enjoy reading online journalism; MB (41.0%) and MC (38.8%) students were more likely than MA (31.0%) students to enjoy reading blogs; MA (38.9%) and MB (37.1%) students were more likely than MC (26.5%) students to enjoy reading comics; and MC students (12.2%) were slightly more likely than MA (9.7%) and MB (9.5%) students to say that they do not like reading any kind of text.

These findings, along with the finding that MC students enjoy reading books of nonfiction (including personal narrative) more than MA and MB students (see Tables 16a and 16b in Appendix D), would seem to support the idea that there is a stronger relationship between *enjoyment of* fiction reading (not necessarily amount of or time spent reading fiction) and literacy level than there is between literacy level and other types of reading. For example, MB and MC students are *more* likely to enjoy reading print magazines than MA students are, and there is little difference between MA and MC students when it comes to enjoyment of reading blogs. However, other than enjoyment of other nonfiction ($p < 0.05;\ p = 0.021$) and print newspapers ($p < 0.05;\ p = 0.012$), none of these relationships were statistically significant, so more evidence would be needed to make definitive claims for this result.

2.4. In What Language(s) Do You Read Recreationally?

When asked in what language they usually do their recreational reading, 69% of students indicated that they mostly like to read in English. Of the others, 22% say that they mostly read in another language, and of those, 55% indicated that the other language is French; 18% say they read in both French and English; 11% indicate that they read in French and another language; and 5% say they read in French, English

and another language. Other recreational reading languages include Armenian, Hebrew, Spanish, Russian and "Chinese". Of all the students surveyed, 9% say that they do not read recreationally in any language. All in all, 74% of MA students, 67% of MB students and 65% of MC students reported that when they read recreationally, they mostly read in English.

2.5. How Much Recreational Reading of Fiction Do You Do?

2.5.1. How Many Mooks of Fiction Did You Read for Fun this Past Year?

Table 7
"How many books of fiction have you read for fun in the last year?"

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	81	30.3	30.3	30.3
	1-3	107	40.1	40.1	70.4
	4-6	37	13.9	13.9	84.3
	7-9	23	8.6	8.6	92.9
	10+	19	7.1	7.1	100.0
	Total	267	100.0	100.0	

When asked *how many books of fiction* they had read for fun in the previous year (see Table 7), 30% of students said that they had read none, 40% said they had read between 1 and 3 books, and only 30% indicated that they had read 4 books or more, including the 7% who had read 10 or more books in the past year.

If we analyze the numbers in terms of level, some associations between literacy level and number of books read present themselves.

Table 8
"How many books of fiction have you read for fun in the last year?": By Cohort

		Number of Books of Fiction					
		None	1-3	4-6	7-9	10+	Total
MA	Count	31	44	17	8	13	113
	% within 101 Level	27.4%	38.9%	15.0%	7.1%	11.5%	100.0%
	% within Number of Books of Fiction	38.3%	41.1%	45.9%	34.8%	68.4%	42.3%
	% of Total	11.6%	16.5%	6.4%	3.0%	4.9%	42.3%
MB	Count	33	45	14	8	5	105
	% within 101 Level	31.4%	42.9%	13.3%	7.6%	4.8%	100.0%
	% within Number of Books of Fiction	40.7%	42.1%	37.8%	34.8%	26.3%	39.3%
	% of Total	12.4%	16.9%	5.2%	3.0%	1.9%	39.3%
MC	Count	17	18	6	7	1	49
	% within 101 Level	34.7%	36.7%	12.2%	14.3%	2.0%	100.0%
	% within Number of Books of Fiction	21.0%	16.8%	16.2%	30.4%	5.3%	18.4%
	% of Total	6.4%	6.7%	2.2%	2.6%	0.4%	18.4%
Total	Count	81	107	37	23	19	267
	% within 101 Level	30.3%	40.1%	13.9%	8.6%	7.1%	100.0%
	% within Number of Books of Fiction	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	30.3%	40.1%	13.9%	8.6%	7.1%	100.0%

As Table 8 shows, in the non-remedial (MA) cohort, 12% of students indicate that they have read 10 or more books of fiction for fun in the past year, as opposed to 5% in MB and 2% in MC. If we total all students in each cohort who have read 4 or more books of fiction, we arrive at 33.4% for MA students, 25.7% for MB and 28.5%

for MC. Therefore, within this sample, those at the remedial level MC were more likely than MB students – whose literacy level is technically higher – to report at least occasionally reading books of fiction for recreation, and non-remedial (MA) students were most likely to report reading 4 or more books of fiction during the year. However, $p > 0.1$ ($p = 0.328$) suggests weak evidence for the relationship.

2.5.2. How Many Hours a Week Did You Spend Reading Fiction?

Students were also asked *how many hours a week, on average, they spent reading fiction.*

Table 9
"How many hours per week did you spend reading fiction?"

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0 hours	86	32.2	32.3	32.3
	Less than 1 hour	70	26.2	26.3	58.6
	1-2 hours	41	15.4	15.4	74.1
	2-4 hours	57	21.3	21.4	95.5
	4+ hours	12	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	266	99.6	100.0	
Missing	99.00	1	.4		
Total		267	100.0		

Table 9 shows that 32% of students surveyed reported that in the past year they have spent no time at all reading fiction; 26% reported that, although they spent some time, it was less than 1 hour a week; 15% said that they read between 1 and 2 hours a week; 21% read for more than 2 but less than 4 hours; and 5% estimated that they read fiction for at least 4 hours a week.

If we divide these results by cohort, we see some differences.

Table 10
"How many hours per week did you spend reading fiction?: By Cohort

		0 hours	Less than 1 hour	1-2 hours	2-4 hours	4+ hours	Total
MA	Count	33	34	13	25	8	113
	% within 101 Level	**29.2%**	**30.1%**	**11.5%**	**22.1%**	**7.1%**	100.0%
	% within Hours Reading Fiction	38.4%	48.6%	31.7%	43.9%	66.7%	42.5%
	% of Total	12.4%	12.8%	4.9%	9.4%	3.0%	42.5%
MB	Count	35	24	21	23	1	104
	% within 101 Level	**33.7%**	**23.1%**	**20.2%**	**22.1%**	**1.0%**	100.0%
	% within Hours Reading Fiction	40.7%	34.3%	51.2%	40.4%	8.3%	39.1%
	% of Total	13.2%	9.0%	7.9%	8.6%	0.4%	39.1%
MC	Count	18	12	7	9	3	49
	% within 101 Level	**36.7%**	**24.5%**	**14.3%**	**18.4%**	**6.1%**	100.0%
	% within Hours Reading Fiction	20.9%	17.1%	17.1%	15.8%	25.0%	18.4%
	% of Total	6.8%	4.5%	2.6%	3.4%	1.1%	18.4%
Total	Count	86	70	41	57	12	266
	% within 101 Level	32.3%	26.3%	15.4%	21.4%	4.5%	100.0%
	% within Hours Reading Fiction	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	32.3%	26.3%	15.4%	21.4%	4.5%	100.0%

Table 10 indicates that 7% percent of MA students, 1% of MB students and 6% of MC students said that they spent more than 4 hours a week reading fiction. If we total the numbers who say they spent at least 1 hour a week reading fiction in the last year, the numbers are as follows:

MA: 40.7%

MB: 43.3%

MC: 38.8%

So, if self-reported numbers are to be believed, 101-MB students read a smaller number of books of fiction than MA or MC students in the year before this survey was conducted, but spent more hours a week reading them.

2.5.3. How Many Hours Would You Spend Reading Fiction Each Week If You Could?

Students were also asked *how much time they would spend reading books of fiction if they had as much free time as they wanted*. 24% said that they would spend no time on this activity; 20% said that they would spend less than one hour; 18% said they would spend 1-2 hours a week; 24% said 2-4 hours a week; and 14% said that they would spend more than 4 hours a week reading fiction if they had the chance. Again, cohorts differed in response to this question.

Table 11

"Given unlimited free time, how many hours would you spend per week reading books of fiction for fun?": By Cohort

		0 hours	Less than 1 hour	1-2 hours	2-4 hours	4+ hours	Total
MA	Count	19	20	21	30	23	113
	% within 101 Level	**16.8%**	**17.7%**	**18.6%**	**26.5%**	**20.4%**	100.0%
	% within Ideal Amount of Fic Reading Time	29.2%	37.7%	44.7%	46.9%	60.5%	42.3%
	% of Total	7.1%	7.5%	7.9%	11.2%	8.6%	42.3%
MB	Count	32	18	18	27	10	105
	% within 101 Level	**30.5%**	**17.1%**	**17.1%**	**25.7%**	**9.5%**	100.0%
	% within Ideal Amount of Fic Reading Time	49.2%	34.0%	38.3%	42.2%	26.3%	39.3%
	% of Total	12.0%	6.7%	6.7%	10.1%	3.7%	39.3%
MC	Count	14	15	8	7	5	49
	% within 101 Level	**28.6%**	**30.6%**	**16.3%**	**14.3%**	**10.2%**	100.0%
	% within Ideal Amount of Fic Reading Time	21.5%	28.3%	17.0%	10.9%	13.2%	18.4%
	% of Total	5.2%	5.6%	3.0%	2.6%	1.9%	18.4%
Total	Count	65	53	47	64	38	267
	% within 101 Level	**24.3%**	**19.9%**	**17.6%**	**24.0%**	**14.2%**	100.0%
	% within Ideal Amount of Fic Reading Time	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	24.3%	19.9%	17.6%	24.0%	14.2%	100.0%

Table 11 shows that more MA students (21%) than MB (10%) or MC (10%) students say that, given as much free time as they wanted, they would spend 4 or more hours reading fiction in a week. If we total the students who would spend at least an hour a week reading if they could, the results are the following:

MA: 65.5%

MB: 52.3%

MC: 40.8%

So a reasonable majority of MA (non-remedial) students say that if they had more free time, they would spend at least some of it reading fiction. In the MC (second-tier remedial) group, considerably fewer than half of the students say so. It is also interesting that only 17% of MA students say they would spend *no* free time reading fiction, as compared to 31% of MB students and 29% of MC students. $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.046$) indicates that there is strong evidence for a relationship between 101 course placement level and a desire to spend free time reading fiction.

What is more, 44% of students said that, if they had as much free time as they wanted, they would spend *more* of it reading fiction than they currently do, and this percentage differs across cohorts.

Table 12
Would Spend More Time Reading Fiction if had Unlimited Free Time: By Cohort

		Yes	No	Total
MA	Count	60	53	113
	% within 101 Level	**53.1%**	**46.9%**	100.0%
	% within More Free Time Would Read More	51.3%	35.8%	42.6%
	% of Total	22.6%	20.0%	42.6%
MB	Count	42	62	104
	% within 101 Level	**40.4%**	**59.6%**	100.0%
	% within More Free Time Would Read More	35.9%	41.9%	39.2%
	% of Total	15.8%	23.4%	39.2%
MC	Count	15	33	48
	% within 101 Level	**31.3%**	**68.8%**	100.0%
	% within More Free Time Would Read More	12.8%	22.3%	18.1%
	% of Total	5.7%	12.5%	18.1%
Total	Count	117	148	265
	% within 101 Level	44.2%	55.8%	100.0%
	% within More Free Time Would Read More	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	44.2%	55.8%	100.0%

Even though MA students say that they are already reading more books of fiction than MB and MC students, Table 12 shows that they also are more likely (53%) than MB (40%) and MC (31%) students to say that they would, if given as much free time as they wanted, spend *more* of it reading fiction than they do now. The finding of $p < 0.05$ $(p = 0.023)$ provides strong evidence for this relationship: the table clearly demonstrates an association between literacy placement level and an interest in reading more fiction if time allowed.

3. READING HABITS AND ATTITUDES TOWARD READING IN THE FAMILY HOME

In addition to being asked about their own recreational reading habits, as well as their attitudes toward reading, students were asked a series of open-ended questions about their background experience with and exposure to recreational reading, especially fiction reading, in their family environments. The purpose of these open-ended questions was to provide some contextual qualitative data. Such contextual data might give insight into a student's current position with regard to recreational fiction reading, and might provide other variables to consider, especially where counterintuitive findings are concerned (for example, situations in which a student has strong literacy skills but claims to do no recreational reading). Given the references in the literature to the ways that print exposure can influence literacy level (Echols et al, 1996), it seemed valuable to acknowledge a student's family context when trying to gain a complete picture of their relationship to fiction reading. These open-ended questions were analyzed through coding and extrapolation of themes.

3.1. Family Reading Habits and Attitudes Toward Reading

When asked whether people in their immediate family like to read recreationally, 73% of students were able to name at least one immediate family

member who enjoyed this activity. Only 20% said that their parents did not like to read and did not name any other family members who enjoyed it. There was a variation between cohorts, however.

Table 13
"At least one member of my immediate family enjoys reading": By Cohort

		Not mentioned	No	Yes	Total
MA	Count	3	22	88	113
	% within 101 Level	**2.7%**	**19.5%**	**77.9%**	100.0%
	% within 1 + Family Memb Reads	15.8%	40.7%	45.4%	42.3%
	% of Total	1.1%	8.2%	33.0%	42.3%
MB	Count	12	18	75	105
	% within 101 Level	**11.4%**	**17.1%**	**71.4%**	100.0%
	% within 1 + Family Memb Reads	63.2%	33.3%	38.7%	39.3%
	% of Total	4.5%	6.7%	28.1%	39.3%
MC	Count	4	14	31	49
	% within 101 Level	**8.2%**	**28.6%**	**63.3%**	100.0%
	% within 1 + Family Memb Reads	21.1%	25.9%	16.0%	18.4%
	% of Total	1.5%	5.2%	11.6%	18.4%
Total	Count	19	54	194	267
	% within 101 Level	7.1%	20.2%	72.7%	100.0%
	% within 1 + Family Memb Reads	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	7.1%	20.2%	72.7%	100.0%

Table 13 demonstrates that 78% of MA students, 71% of MB students, and 63% of MC students said that yes, at least one member of their immediate family enjoys reading.

Among MA students in particular, there were a few descriptions of seemingly ideal "reading families" who had the perhaps predictable effect of producing children who love reading fiction:

> I live with both my mother and grandmother, and both enjoy reading. Since my grandmother is retired she spends most of her time reading. I remember when I was younger, I would look around the living room and my mother's room and see many books on the shelves. My mother's shelves had books both in French and in English. She had classics like: "Les Chevaliers d'Emeraude", "Amos Daragon", "Pakkal" in French and in English: "The Lord of the Rings" and "Harry Potter". My tastes in books resembles that of my mother and grandmother, as well as my aunt and cousin. Now and then, I'll even recommend some books that I enjoyed to them. (MA student who says that she read at least 24 books of fiction the previous year)

> My parents enjoy reading quite a bit. My father has been reading 1-2 books a week for as long as I can recall. I've always had access to a huge quantity of fiction titles at home, with an additional huge quantity at my disposal at the local library. I am mostly a fan of hard science fiction, with occasional delves into the realm of fantasy and regular fiction. I find non-fiction unfathomably dull. My mother and father would read fiction to my brother and I until we were able to read it ourselves, at which point I began reading almost constantly. The beginning of High School limited my time significantly, but I still read a lot during my holidays. (MA student who says he read at least 20 books of fiction the previous year)

These stories were rare, even among MA students. Among MB students, a number reported that their family members enjoyed reading but that they themselves did not:

> When I was younger reading was really important in my household. We had plenty of books and the library was close enough from our place so it was easy to go rent some books. As I grew up though I started to do other things than reading and nowadays I don't read anymore in my free time. My family though still reads a lot and since my parents read a lot my little sisters also read a lot. (MB student who says he read only one book of fiction for fun in the previous year)

> My entire family are reading nuts! My father reads the most and the biggest books and constantly incourages me to pick up the habbit of reading....but the only books I've ever loved were books about the anatomy/biology of animals (reptiles, mammals, fish) and dinosaurs. (MB student who says he read 1-3 books of fiction in the previous year)

Some students attributed their lack of interest in reading to their parents' lack of interest:

> I don't think my parents like reading much. When growing up i did not have much books in my house....Reading wasn't done unless it was for school. I think my dislike for reading comes from my parents because from a young age i never really saw them read for "fun". (MB student who says he dislikes reading and read no books of fiction for fun in the previous year)

Others say that their parents directly influenced their love of reading:

> I am reading more then anyone [in my family] now but it came from my observation of their behaviors. (MB student)

3.2 Parental Encouragement of Reading Habits

There were spontaneous mentions of ways that parents encouraged their children to read: 22% of MA students and 22% of MB students, but only 12% of MC students, mentioned explicitly (but without being asked directly) that their parents bought them a lot of books, took them to the library, read to them at night, or otherwise encouraged them to enjoy books:

> My mom sparked my interest in book by theatrically reading them to me throughout my childhood. (MA student who read more than 10 books of fiction the previous year)

> My parents always read me stories before bed, which is why I used to enjoy reading so much. (MA student who read no books of fiction last year, but says she would spent 1-2 hours a week reading if she had more free time)

In a few instances, however, students reported that their parents or others "forcing" them or "nagging" them to read actually had a negative effect:

> I enjoy reading fictional books just like my older sister, but I lost my motivation due to my mom nagging me to read the ones SHE enjoys during the summer (to improve my reading skills at school, which did not work). I want to read for my personal enjoyment, not for others. (MB student who read 1-3 books of fiction in the previous year)

> [M]y parents don't really read. But they used to force me. Even if I had a lot of book when I was a kid I still hate reading and I never read the books I had. (MC student who read 1-3 books of fiction in the previous year)

A couple of students said that they did not feel that their family's reading habits or the number of books in their home had much effect on them as readers.

> There were more books at my house when I was younger because my parents thought it would encourage me to read but that didn't really work out. (MA student who read no books of fiction for enjoyment in the previous year)

3.3. Differences Between Students' Attitudes Toward Reading and their Parents'

One interesting finding was the percentages of students in each cohort who said that *they* did not like reading recreationally but that *at least one parent* did. Out of 113 MA students, 53 answered the question "Do you like to read books for fun in your spare time?" with "No" or "Rarely". Of those 53 students, 32 (60%) say that at least one of their parents/guardians likes to read for fun. Of the 52 MB students who say that they do not or rarely like to read books for fun, 25 (48%) say that at least one of their parents/guardians likes to read. 24 MC students say that they do not/rarely like reading, and 8 (33%) of those claim that at least one of their parents likes to read for fun.

"I do not like reading, but at least one of my caregivers does":

MA: 60%

MB: 48%

MC: 33%

The percentages here point to some interesting questions: is it possible that parents who read have an impact of the literacy level of their children even if their children are not readers? Or is there an external variable in a literate family that influences the literacy level of the child?

3.4. Print Exposure in the Home

Students were also asked whether there were "a lot of books" in their home and whether these included "a lot of fiction." The validity of these questions is suspect, given that "a lot" was not clearly defined, but given that all students were given the same question to grapple with, the results are worth looking at. Overall, 56% of students indicated that yes, there were "a lot" of books in their household. This broke down across cohorts as follows:

Table 14
"There were a lot of books in my household": By Cohort

		Not Mentioned	No	Yes	Total
MA	Count	19	22	72	113
	% within 101 Level	**16.8%**	**19.5%**	**63.7%**	100.0%
	% within A Lot of Books in Household	30.2%	40.7%	48.0%	42.3%
	% of Total	7.1%	8.2%	27.0%	42.3%
MB	Count	32	16	57	105
	% within 101 Level	**30.5%**	**15.2%**	**54.3%**	100.0%
	% within A Lot of Books in Household	50.8%	29.6%	38.0%	39.3%
	% of Total	12.0%	6.0%	21.3%	39.3%
MC	Count	12	16	21	49
	% within 101 Level	**24.5%**	**32.7%**	**42.9%**	100.0%
	% within A Lot of Books in Household	19.0%	29.6%	14.0%	18.4%
	% of Total	4.5%	6.0%	7.9%	18.4%
Total	Count	63	54	150	267
	% within 101 Level	23.6%	20.2%	56.2%	100.0%
	% within A Lot of Books in Household	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	23.6%	20.2%	56.2%	100.0%

The finding outlined in Table 14, showing that non-remedial students (MA: 63.7%) are more likely than remedial students (MB: 54.3%; MC: 42.9%) to report "a lot" of books in their households, is statistically significant ($p = 0.016$). This statistically significant finding points to some discussion in the literature that suggests that print exposure in the home has a positive association with literacy level (Echols et al, 1996).

When asked whether those books included a lot of books of fiction, only 35% of students clearly identified that this was the case (note: 41% did not respond to the question about fiction, and 25% said no, they didn't have a lot of fiction books in their households.) The breakdown by cohort is revealing.

Table 15

"When you were growing up, were there a lot of books of fiction in your household?": By Cohort

		Not Mentioned	No	Yes	Total
MA	Count	38	30	45	113
	% within 101 Level	**33.6%**	**26.5%**	**39.8%**	100.0%
	% within A Lot of Fiction Books in Household	34.9%	45.5%	48.9%	42.3%
	% of Total	14.2%	11.2%	16.9%	42.3%
MB	Count	49	20	36	105
	% within 101 Level	**46.7%**	**19.0%**	**34.3%**	100.0%
	% within A Lot of Fiction Books in Household	45.0%	30.3%	39.1%	39.3%
	% of Total	18.4%	7.5%	13.5%	39.3%
MC	Count	22	16	11	49
	% within 101 Level	**44.9%**	**32.7%**	**22.4%**	100.0%
	% within A Lot of Fiction Books in Household	20.2%	24.2%	12.0%	18.4%
	% of Total	8.2%	6.0%	4.1%	18.4%
Total	Count	109	66	92	267
	% within 101 Level	**40.8%**	**24.7%**	**34.5%**	100.0%
	% within A Lot of Fiction Books in Household	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	40.8%	24.7%	34.5%	100.0%

Table 15 shows that 40% of MA students, but only 34% of MB students and 22% of MC students, revealed that they were exposed to plenty of books of fiction in their homes. This would also be consistent with the literature that suggests that print exposure can be positively associated with literacy level.

One interesting finding was that two MA students reported that one of their parents owned a bookstore! (one a comic-book store). Both of these students say that they do not enjoy reading (one rarely, one not at all). One might ask oneself if

exposure to an unusual number of books might have had an impact, as they are both in a non-remedial 101 course despite their lack of interest in reading on their own.

3.5. Other Observations and Comments About Reading in the Family

A few other themes arose spontaneously in student responses to these open-ended questions about habits, practices and attitudes around recreational reading in their homes. These themes were not explicitly solicited by the questions, but could provide foundations for future research; asking all students direct, even multiple-choice, questions about these topics might yield interesting data.

3.5.1. Lack of Time for Reading

A number of students (12% of MA students, 2% of MB students, and 10% of MC students) said, unsolicited, that they and/or their parents don't read books because they don't have time. In some cases, students suggested that they or their parents, or both, read when they were younger or enjoy reading in general, but they are simply too busy:

> Generally, my whole family enjoys reading but we very rarely do it. We only really read in the summer time and when we're on family vacation. During the school year I can't really find the time to read a book....My reading habits do in fact resemble my sister's and my mother's reading habits. We usually read on vacation. (MA student)

> My parents enjoy reading, however they don't have much time because they work all the time....I read more when I was younger, although as I got older I started focusing on other things. (MC student)

3.5.2. Students' Perceptions of Reasons for and Impact of Recreational Reading

Some students strayed from discussions of family habits to explain, on their own volition, why they themselves like reading and what positive effects they believe it has.

> I believe reading is the best tool to educate ourselves, even over schools. I read everyday to improve my skills in what interest me, which is totally different from school. (MB student)

> Personally, reading is one of the many ways for me to relax and put myself in my own little imaginary bubble (my own little world) and to put myself aside from everyone else for a little bit. It makes me think and helps me sleep at night. Reading is a completely different experience than watching a movie or a clip version of. Reading works your creativity and makes you imagine the scenarios in your head. And words just have an effect on people really. :) (MA student)

> Reading is learning, reading is improving your writting skills and that's what's important and it helped me understand some things better and it enriched my vocabulary. (MB student)

And some students who don't enjoy reading acknowledged that they wished they could enjoy it more, as they felt it would have a positive impact on them.

> I completely hate reading books on my spare time even though it would enrich my vocabulary. (MB student)

3.5.3. Influence of Current Technologies and Other Entertainment/Activities on Reading Habits

Although some explained that they have become distracted from reading by forms of entertainment that are "easier", like online browsing or watching TV...:

> When I was 12 years old, I moved to Canada, I wasn't able to bring lots of books, so I started to read them online. But online, there are so many interesting text to read, so I became unable (sometimes) to focus on one book and read, which is sad. My brain got used to read short text in very diffrent topics. (MA student)

...others shared experiences that suggested that current technologies have been instrumental in making them readers:

> In the past year or two, I have taken up reading in my free time. My sudden interest in reading occured because of a video game I played and enjoyed very much. The series of books I've been reading were what the video game was based off of. (MA student)

> As I grew older, [my parents] stopped bringing me to the library. Although, that wouldn't stop me to find my own pieces of fiction on my own, I wouldn't really call them books, however, I read a lot of fanfiction every day. I spend on an average about three hours a day reading fanfiction. (MA student)

> I don't prefer to read but last year one of my friend made me realize how much I like the movie Hunger Games that she made me read the whole book. (MB student)

> We don't really own any books...so I read my books online, mostly on an app called Wattpad [a popular online self-publishing platform]. (MB student)

Some students identified other specific experiences that made them take up reading when it held little interest for them before.

> I've never really liked reading until last summer, where I found a trilogy I was really into. (MA student)

> Growing up, I didn't read books except for comics because of the drawings. I started reading books when I started school in Canada in order to learn new words. Ever since I was 12 years old, I started going to the library to read for my own knoledge and to pass time. In all, I'm the youngest and only person in my family that likes to read. (MB student)

All in all, the open-ended questions about family reading habits and attitudes toward reading provided some important complicating data that may be of use to English teachers. This data suggests that print exposure, including exposure to the activity of reading, is an important variable in the development of reading habits and in literacy development, and this suggestion is supported in the literature. There is also an implication that other factors such as a lack of free time and the influence of other technologies have an impact on a student's habits and attitudes. Teachers would do well to consider how curriculum, pedagogy, and the classroom and school context could grapple with these variables, and maybe compensate for a lack of time, print exposure and other formative reading influences in the home.

4. CASE STUDIES

A comparison of responses to open-ended questions, survey questions and placement scores revealed some atypical cases. These cases led to further insight into the multitude of variables that might influence a student's literacy level.

For example, there were cases in which a student claimed to love reading and to read regularly in English, but did not demonstrate sufficient skill on the Placement Test to be placed in a non-remedial 101 course. One student identified his mother tongue as Greek but said that he and his family usually speak English at home. He

said that yes, he does enjoy reading books, primarily fiction, for fun, and that although he went to a French high school, he does most of his recreational reading in English. He had read between 7 and 9 books of fiction for his own enjoyment in the previous year, and spent between two and four hours a week reading fiction recreationally. He wrote that his parents "enjoy reading very much" in their spare time, and that although he did not read as much in his childhood as he does now, he did enjoy fiction even then. Nevertheless, he scored 53/100 on his Placement Test and was placed in a 101-MC (second-tier remedial) course. Some analysis of his Placement Test reveals difficulties with such higher-level grammatical functions as verb agreement with indefinite pronouns ("each are"), plural possessives ("the boss'"), capitalization ("english"), pronoun consistency ("one can save your pay"), and coordinating conjunctions vs. multi-word prepositions ("and" vs. "as well as"). However, the student scored 34/42 (81%) on the multiple-choice grammar section of the Placement Test. On the questions involving literary analysis and comprehension (involving identifying themes and literary techniques in poems and stories), he answered only 7/20 multiple-choice questions correctly. In his written analytical response, he did not demonstrate an understanding of "theme" (he summarized the plot of the story he was asked to analyze, rather than identifying an overarching idea the author is trying to illustrate) and did not mention any literary devices even though he was explicitly asked to do so. The questions raised by Ross and Gilbert and Fister about whether recreational reading can "[prevent] students from getting very far toward reading in deliberate and self-conscious ways" (Gilbert and Fister 2011) come to mind here: in this student's case, did his extensive recreational reading lead to a greater facility with accurate language use but a lack of analytical skill? Or is this simply a case of a student who has not yet acquired terminology like "theme" and "literary device" and so is not in a position to correctly respond to them?

One MB (first-tier remedial) student identified his mother tongue and home language as Armenian, and his language of high school study as French. He said that he "sometimes" likes to read books for fun; that when he does, they are primarily

fiction or personal narrative; and that when he does read recreationally, it is mostly in English. At the time of this study, he had read 4-6 books of fiction in the previous year, spending less than an hour a week reading fiction recreationally, but said that, given as much free time as he wanted, he would spend 7-8 hours a week reading fiction. Here is how he described the place of reading in his family life:

> My parents don't read books at all. They prefer watching TV or doing outdoor activities. I think it's because they spend so much time at work that they don't have energy to read, especially if they're mentally draining books. My dad reads the newspaper from time to time. On the other hand, my brother (who is 21 years old) LOVES reading. He used to read Edgar Allan Poe's works and he was a big fan. He also loves all the Harry Potter books (except for the 3rd one for some odd reason). I've never been able to figure out what kinds of books interest me. I liked John Green's books and stories that are based on adventure.

A couple of things about this student are striking. One is that he not only identified a specific author that he likes (John Green) but also was able to identify his brother's favourite author (not all CEGEP students will know who Edgar Allan Poe is!) The "Author Recognition Test" mentioned earlier is considered a reliable indicator of print exposure, which has in turn been linked to literacy achievement (Echols et al, 1996), and this would suggest that exposure to his brother's reading habits might have had a positive impact on this student's literacy skills. Another notable thing about this case is that neither the student's mother tongue nor his primary language of study is English, but his writing skill in this substantial paragraph was superior to that of most MB and many MA students - he used complex, interesting sentences and did not make a single spelling or grammatical error. One might wonder what influence his brother's love of reading had on him despite his parents' lack thereof.

One might also ask oneself how this student ended up with a score of 56/100 on his Placement Test, and in an MB (remedial tier 1) class, at all. He achieved only

25/42 on the grammatical section of the test and 11/20 on the literary analysis multiple-choice section. Nevertheless, the written production portion of his test demonstrates a good understanding of a theme, and correctly identifies elements of the assigned story like the main character/narrator (distinguishing between those terms), the first-person point of view, foreshadowing, imagery, repetition, and "satirical devices such as sarcasm". However, although these devices are correctly identified and illustrated with examples, no analysis of the use of these devices and their relationship to the theme is given. This would appear to be a student who has received some education in literary analysis skills already, but less in the elements of English grammar, and has not yet made the leap from understanding what literary devices are to understanding how they are used to develop ideas in a text.

One Anglophone MC student reported that she "rarely" likes to read books recreationally, but when she does, she likes to read fiction and personal narrative; she also likes reading print magazines and blogs. She read between 1 and 3 books the previous year and spent 1-2 hours reading per week, but, given as much free time as she wanted, she would read NO books of fiction. She described her family's reading habits as follows:

> My parents enjoy reading, however they don't have much time, because they work all the time. There were many books, such as children books like Robert Munch etc. I read more when I was younger, although as I got older I started focusing on other things. Since my family doesn't read alot we tend to do family activities such as vacationing, skiing, getting together with family members/friends etc. I don't think my reading habits resemble other people in my family because my two younger brothers love to read so much. They can read every night, unlike, me who does not read very often, but when I am introduced to a novel that I really enjoy I am hooked!

Once again, the writing skill demonstrated in this paragraph is superior to that of a typical 101-MC student - she makes a few sentence structure ("My parents enjoy reading, however they..."), grammatical ("children books") and spelling ("alot")

errors but they are not pervasive and do not interfere with understanding. However, she scored only 51/100 on her test: 24/42 (57%) on the grammatical portion and 8/20 (40%) on the multiple-choice literary analysis portion. In her written response, she correctly identifies a theme of the story provided but does not identify any literary devices (other than correctly labelling the "main character"). She demonstrates a good basic understanding of the events of the story and the theme that they illustrate, however. Despite her low score on the test, if I were evaluating this student based entirely on the writing sample (as would have been done by English teachers in the past), I would place her in a 101-MB course. Given that her questionnaire suggests that she has been exposed to print materials and regular recreational reading habits in her home, and her assertion that she does like reading when she finds a book that interests her, one wonders whether associations between her habits and her course placement level might be misleading. One also wonders whether asking for information about her reading habits before finalizing her course placement might have been useful.

On the other side of the coin is a student placed in the non-remedial 101-MA stream who said that, although he himself does not enjoy reading, his family members do. Although his first language is English, he did his high school studies in French. He said that he unequivocally does not like reading; when asked to identify any kinds of books that he likes, he chose both "fiction" and "I don't really like reading any kind of book." (He does, however, like reading print magazines.) When asked what language he usually reads in, he chose "I did not read any texts for enjoyment in the last year." He indicated that he spent no time reading fiction recreationally and that, if given as much free time as he wanted, this would not change. When asked about his family's reading habits, he responded,

> Everyone on my moms side of the family reads tones of books. I have never liked reading, I hate it since it has always been a challenge since I am english

> but I have never been to an english school. I have been studying in french, although it's not my first language so I have more difficulty.

This student scored 74 on his Placement Test: 35/42 (83%) on the grammar section and 13/20 (65%) on the literary analysis section. The student's written analytical response summarized the assigned story accurately but did not identify any literary techniques other than "image," which the student did not correctly understand or support; the student ended the analysis with a moral ("I believe that the moral of the story is that we should take advantage, cherrish and appreciate special moments..."). This does not indicate a lot of insight, but the understanding of the story is sound overall, and the grammatical accuracy of the student's response would be consistent with a 101-MA placement: there are some comma use and pronoun errors ("a father and a son, that have never met"), verb form errors ("would of"), spelling errors ("rolemodel") and sentence structure errors ("Although, maybe if..."), but they are typical of a first-language speaker at this level, and don't indicate a need for remediation. This raises the question of whether a strong reading habit within the family context can have an impact on a student's literacy skills even if the student himself does not read recreationally, but it also reminds us that there are many other variables that can affect a student's preparedness in reading and writing, and that these variables can be challenging to identify.

These vignettes and case studies, although anecdotal, provide some support for the numerical findings, but also point to some important questions. If the impact of reading habits, attitudes around reading and reading environments is so complex, where is a college-level English teacher to begin wrestling with the problem? Is there a way to address deficits in recreational reading background once students arrive in our classrooms? Both these findings and the general literature suggest some places to start.

5. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

5.1 Primary Research Question

The primary research question was: For Vanier College students in English 101 classes, to what extent are *quantity* and *frequency* of *recreational reading* of *long-form fiction* positively associated with *literacy achievement* in English? The hypotheses were that both quantity and frequency of recreational reading of long-form fiction are positively associated with literacy achievement.

5.1.1. Quantity

Within this sample, non-remedial (MA) students were most likely to report reading 4 or more books of fiction during the year (33.4% as opposed to 25.7% of MB students and 28.5% of MC students). They were also more likely to report reading 10 or more books of fiction during the year (12%, as opposed to 5% in MB and 2% in MC). However, $p > 0.1$ ($p = 0.328$) suggests weak evidence for the relationship. Although data in this sample appears to show support for this hypothesis, the result is not statistically significant and so the hypothesis that quantity of recreational reading of long-form fiction is positively associated with literacy achievement remains unsubstantiated.

5.1.2. Frequency

More non-remedial (MA) students (7%) than remedial (MB: 1%; MC: 6%) students said that they spent more than 4 hours a week reading fiction. However, more first-tier remedial (MB) students (43%) than non-remedial students (41%) said that they spent at least 1 hour a week reading fiction. The hypothesis that frequency of recreational reading of long-form fiction is positively associated with literacy achievement remains unsubstantiated.

5.2. Secondary Research Question

The secondary research question was: For Vanier College students in English 101 classes, to what extent is enjoyment of reading long-form fiction, and desire to do so, positively associated with literacy achievement in English? The hypotheses were that both enjoyment of and desire to read long-form fiction are positively associated with literacy achievement.

5.2.1. Enjoyment

Of MA (non-remedial) students, 88% say that they like to read books of fiction, as compared to 76% of MB students and 65% of MC students. This observed association is statistically significant ($p < 0.01;\ p = 0.004$). The hypothesis that enjoyment of reading long-form fiction is positively associated with literacy achievement was substantiated.

5.2.2. Desire

Twenty-one percent of MA students, 10% of MB students, and 10% of MC students say that, given as much free time as they wanted, they would spend 4 or

more hours reading fiction in a week. A similar result appeared for students who would spend at least one hour a week reading fiction (MA: 66%**;** MB: 52%**;** MC: 41%). Only 17% of MA students say they would spend *no* free time reading fiction, as compared to 31% of MB students and 29% of MC students. $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.046$) indicates that these results are statistically significant. MA students also are more likely (53%) than MB (40%) and MC (31%) students to say that they would, if given as much free time as they wanted, spend *more* of it reading fiction than they do now. The finding of $p < 0.05$ ($p = 0.023$) provides strong evidence for this relationship. The hypothesis that desire to read long-form fiction is positively associated with literacy achievement was substantiated.

5.3. Additional Results

When students were asked whether they liked to read books other than books of fiction, MC (second-tier remedial) students were more likely than other students to say that they enjoy reading personal narratives (35%, vs. 27% of MA students and 25% of MB students) and other nonfiction (41%, vs. 31% of MA students and 20% of MB students). Of MC students, 38% say they like to read print newspapers, as opposed to 23% of MA (non-remedial) and 15% of MB students. MB (32%) and MC (31%) students were more likely than MA (28%) students to enjoy reading print magazines; MB (41%) and MC (39%) students were more likely than MA (31%) students to enjoy reading blogs. These findings would seem to support the idea that there is a stronger relationship between *enjoyment of* fiction reading and literacy level than there is between literacy level and other types of reading. However, other than enjoyment of other nonfiction ($p < 0.05$; $p = 0.021$) and print newspapers ($p < 0.05$; $p = 0.012$), none of these relationships were statistically significant. Also, this reported enjoyment does not tell us how much of this kind of reading these students actually do. The question of whether recreational reading of long-form fiction is more

strongly associated with literacy level than other types of reading is one that deserves further exploration.

5.4. Family Reading Habits and Attitudes Toward Reading

The open-ended questions about family reading habits and attitudes toward reading elicited responses that suggest that exposure to reading in the family of origin is an important and extremely complex influence. Within this sample, non-remedial students reported more exposure to reading and books within their family homes than did remedial students, as well as more encouragement to read. The qualitative nature of these responses, and the less-than-precise wording of some of the questions, make this data difficult to analyze; this is a topic that warrants further investigation. In the meantime, teachers of remedial English 101 courses might benefit from knowing that their students are less likely to have strong reading influences around them at home, and might wish to consider how they as teachers might address such deficits.

CHAPTER SIX: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

1. ANALYSIS

The primary purpose of this study was to gather information about the recreational fiction-reading habits, as well as attitudes toward reading fiction and background reading experiences, of English 101 students at CEGEP Vanier College, particularly where long-form fiction (novel) reading is concerned, and to identify any associations between those variables and students' literacy achievement, as measured by their results on the Vanier College English Placement Test (and any adjustment to those results deemed appropriate by the Placement Coordinator and/or the student's English 101 teacher). It was hypothesized that quantity, frequency, enjoyment, and desired frequency of recreational reading of long-form fiction are positively associated with literacy achievement.

The survey revealed some important (and statistically significant) findings. Students placed in non-remedial (MA) English 101 courses (those who are found to have adequate college-level literacy skills) are more likely than remedial students to say that they enjoy reading fiction. The obverse of this finding might be even more meaningful: materially more remedial than non-remedial students *do not* identify fiction as a genre that they enjoy. More non-remedial students say that, given as much free time as they wanted, they would spend at least an hour a week reading fiction; materially fewer non-remedial than remedial students say they would spend NO free time reading fiction. What is more, even though non-remedial students say that they are *already* reading more books of fiction than remedial students, they also are more likely to say that they would, if given as much free time as they wanted, spend *more* of it reading fiction than they do now.

The findings above do not tell us about the reading *habits* of students and their association with literacy skills. It would be worth asking these questions of a much larger sample of students - perhaps all 101 students in a given semester? - to see whether any clear, statistically significant associations could be found. However, the question of attitudes alone is an interesting one. If MA students are more likely to say that they like reading fiction and would spend more time reading it if they could, this opens doors to explorations in their English courses that may be much more tightly closed for MB and MC students. In a 101 course, teachers are asked to teach three literary genres (the essay and two others); according to our departmental curriculum coordinator, close to 100% teachers in our department teach some sort of fiction (short or long) in their 101 courses (she was unable to think of a single example of a teacher who does not include fiction in their course syllabus) (Lynch). If teachers of 101-MA courses can assume that 88% of their students like to read books of fiction, as compared to 76% of 101-MB students and 65% of 101-MC students, this means that their students are beginning the course with an openness to an important portion of the course material that larger numbers of remedial students lack. What is more, as MA students are more likely than MB and MC students to say that they would like to spend more time reading fiction than they do now, they might appreciate being assigned readings of fictional texts and being given the opportunity to do fiction reading that they otherwise have trouble finding time for. MB and MC teachers are encountering a higher, tougher hurdle than MA teachers that goes beyond the skill levels of their students: their students are coming into their courses with less interest, and perhaps outright negativity, toward a major component of the course material. By the time students arrive in CEGEP, can anything be done about this hurdle?

Other interesting findings were in regards to family habits around and attitudes toward reading: more non-remedial students say that at least one member of their immediate family enjoys reading and that there were "a lot" of books in the family home while they were growing up. If the studies on print exposure in the home (Echols et al, 1996) are to be believed, this information gives rise to some other

interesting questions: if students are coming out of a print-poor environment, and this lack of print exposure has had the negative effect on their literacy skills that studies would suggest, is there something to be done at the CEGEP level to compensate for this effect? By the time students arrive in a post-secondary institution, is it too late? Or can we provide a print-rich context in which they can begin to discover and absorb the pleasure that reading books can bring?

2. DISCUSSION

As teachers, we have no control over the family environment, or the amount of print exposure that our students experience before they arrive in our classrooms. However, if we are aware that our 101-MB and MC students are likely to come into our classrooms with less positive attitudes toward, and less consistent exposure to, one of the genres that we often place at the centre of our curriculum, this gives us the chance to examine both our expectations and our pedagogy. What's more, if we take seriously the associations found in the study, the assertion by reader-response theorists that students must experience and respond personally to literature before they can begin to analyze it (Daniels, 2002), and the suggestions by some writers that fiction reading, in particular, helps support improvements in both higher-level cognitive abilities (Djikic et al., 2013) and academic achievement (Moje et al., 2008), we need to question our practice of asking students to engage in literary analysis before they have a strong background in recreational reading.

A central question is: could the 101-MB and MC classrooms be places to begin fostering a love of fiction reading that might lead to stronger literacy, cognitive, and academic skills, as well as a greater appreciation of literature of all kinds and a source for lifelong pleasure and learning? Can anything be done in the CEGEP classroom to provide students with the exposure to and experience with recreational reading that they have so far lacked, thereby making it more likely that they will

continue to read for fun on their own and thereby develop stronger literacy skills throughout their lives? And might it be more important to do so than to ask them to engage in analytical activities that, given their limited reading backgrounds, they may be unprepared for, and unlikely to benefit very much from? Is there an argument to be made that college English teachers, especially those teaching remedial courses, need to be reading teachers as much as they are literature teachers?

The bulk of literature on helping students develop a love of reading focuses on primary and middle-school students. One wonders if some of the techniques explored in this literature could be re-examined and applied to college students who have come this far and possibly have not been exposed to these practices in a meaningful way.

Cremin et al. (2009), for example, have explored ways to develop a "reading for pleasure pedagogy" (p. 15) which focuses on developing a community of readers in the classroom and the school at large. An important element of establishing this community is teachers' identities as readers, particularly as readers of the types of works meant to appeal to their students. Cremin et al.'s research suggests that reading teachers "may not be sufficiently familiar with a diverse enough range of [student-appropriate] writers to enable them to foster reader development, make book recommendations to readers and promote independent reading for pleasure." (p. 12) Cremin et al. emphasize that it is important for teachers to read such literature

> widely and 'outside our comfort zone' as one [participating teacher] described it (e.g. in relation to global literature [etc]). Such reading required persistent support and encouragement, but as the year progressed, their subject knowledge broadened and their interesting in and attitude to the [students'] own reading material became much more positive. (p. 13)

Familiarity with texts that older adolescents and young adults are drawn to (as indicated earlier, almost all [94%] of the participants in this study were between 16 and 19 years old), and willingness to focus on such texts, especially in remedial classes, might be a good first step for college English teachers. Teachers could develop this familiarity through faculty book clubs, departmental subscriptions to appropriate book review publications, blogs and community forums, etc. They could also take time to find out what kinds of books their students, or students in higher-level classes, are already reading for fun; surveying 101-MA students about books they have enjoyed in the last year, for example, might provide interesting suggestions for teachers of MB and MC classes.

According to Cremin et al.'s study, once teachers had a wider view of and experience with literature that might appeal to their students, their classes began to reflect this in a number of ways. Class activities around assigned texts tended to involve more talk and interaction, both teacher-student and student-student. Reading aloud was eventually recognized as a useful pedagogical practice. "Book talk" in general – discussion of "texts, authors, preferences, responses and so forth" (p. 14) developed, and became more spontaneous amongst students. More room was made for sustained independent reading in classrooms. As a result, students "who were previously reluctant readers...[were] drawn in and wanted to read, alone and with friends and began to talk about texts" (p. 15). An understanding developed amongst these teachers that reading is not just a solitary but also a social activity, and this understanding was transmitted to their students, who now had a "history of shared reading experiences and were able to draw fluidly on their knowledge in common as they playfully engaged in motivated text talk together" (p. 16). The researchers observed measurable changes in the students as readers: their attitudes toward reading improved, as did their self-efficacy and confidence as readers, and many more students began choosing to read at home or at school in their free time. The researchers claim that this increase in voluntary recreational reading also had a positive impact on their reading scores and their knowledge of literature. (Atwell

(2007) and Daniels (2002) also focus on reading as a social activity, and on the importance of creating a reading community within the classroom, through "literature circles" (Daniels 2002) and "reading zones" (Atwell 2007), in order to motivate students to become more motivated and skilled readers.)

Given what this study presents concerning the lack of reading experience and enjoyment in our less literate students, can the findings of such researchers as Cremin et al., Atwell and Daniels provide the basis for a pedagogy and curriculum for CEGEP literature classes, one that will meet Ministerial requirements but will also help students develop the important skill of reaching for a book just because they want to? And, to take this a step further: might it be time to reconsider these Ministerial requirements? Is thematic analysis of literary texts, as required in our literature courses and by the provincial English Exit Exam, an important skill and achievement for our students? Could we consider whether such skills could be learned through and applied to texts that our students have greater knowledge of and exposure to – films, advertising, journalistic writing, etc. – and use our literature classes for the purpose of fostering a love and appreciation of literature, in all its forms but especially in the form that our more literate students claim to like most: fiction?

I would argue that such practices could be implemented even now, without large-scale changes to the Ministerial *dévis*. Such a course could integrate a number of practices and conditions that seem to support a love of recreational reading and greater literacy achievement: books chosen to appeal to students, student choice of texts, print exposure, "book talk," and a sense of a "community of readers". My own experiments with a genre-specific post-secondary course (specifically, a 102 [Literary Genres] course on novels about adolescence) have been an attempt to address these possible print deficits. In this course, we read one novel as a whole class in order to review and practice literary analysis skills, but thereafter, students choose one novel,

and then another, from a list of eight possibilities, and present these novels to their classmates. Thus, students are exposed to nine different novels over the course of the semester, not just in terms of content but also physically, as all students are instructed to buy print copies of the books they have chosen and bring them to class throughout the last half of the term. The novels are all coming-of-age stories about adolescence, and are all relatively contemporary; the hope is that this makes them likely to appeal to students of CEGEP age. Students discuss their novels with the other students who have chosen them, but also listen to presentations on the other novels before making a choice of what final book to read for the course. This allows for the rise of much spontaneous "book talk" in the classroom and outside, as students decide on their final reading. Throughout the course, students are asked to reflect on and share their histories as readers (in one early assignment, pairs of students interview one another and then each writes a comparative paragraphs around the topic, "My partner and I are similar/different as readers." All these activities give rise to a small "community of readers," in which students exchange, reflect and advise on how to take pleasure in reading as well as engage in analysis of the texts they read. A wide-scale examination of similar practices in other college-level English courses might be the next step in considering how we could all make the pleasure of reading a focus of CEGEP English course curriculum.

CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSION

1. SUMMARY

This study collected data on the recreational long-form fiction-reading habits, as well as attitudes toward reading long-form fiction, of English 101 students at Vanier College, in order to determine whether there was any association between these variables and students' literacy skills, as evaluated and indicated by their English 101 placement level. The data collected indicated some associations: students with the strongest literacy skills (placed in the MA, or non-remedial, level of English 101) were more likely to enjoy reading books for fun, to enjoy reading novels for fun, to have read at least four novels for fun in the previous year, to have spent at least four hours a week reading novels for fun during the previous year, to desire to spend at least an hour a week reading novels, and to desire to spend more time reading novels than they currently do.

MA students were also more likely to say that at least one member of their immediate family enjoys reading, and that there were a lot of books, including books of fiction, in their family home(s). Both MA and MB (first-tier remedial) students were more likely than MC (second-tier remedial) students to say that their families encouraged reading through book purchases, library visits, bedtime reading and so forth. MA students were also more likely to say that even if they themselves do not like reading, at least one of their caregivers does.

Associations between literacy level and other kinds of reading (for example, nonfiction reading) showed inconsistent associations. Students in the lowest tier (MC) showed a stronger preference for nonfiction book reading and print newspaper

reading than students with higher literacy levels, and indicated a stronger preference for print magazines, online journalism and blogs than at least one of the two higher levels.

2. APPLICABILITY OF FINDINGS

Vanier College is a very particular population. First of all, CEGEPs are institutions specific to the Quebec school system, and no real equivalent exists elsewhere in the world. Surveys of high school seniors in the United States or Ontario might yield very different data from that gathered from students who have already graduated from high school and are embarking on transitional university preparation or professional training.

Also, Vanier is an English college in a city with a majority French-speaking population. Students in this study who were born and raised in Montreal will have grown up in an unusual linguistic context, and in many cases they will have operated at least partly in at least one minority language (English) in addition to the language of the French-speaking majority throughout their lives. Also, Vanier students come from a wide variety of linguistic, cultural and educational backgrounds; most of the students in this survey identified a language other than English as their mother tongue, their language of primary communication at home, and/or their primary language of study in high school, even though most students indicated that when they read for fun, they read in English. Almost a third identified their mother tongue as a language other than English or French.

Therefore, it is unclear how widely the results of this study can be generalized. They are, instead, both a reflection of the particular context in which Vanier teachers and students operate, and a basis upon which other similar studies could be created in order to examine other populations. If anything, this study is an indicator of how

difficult it is to survey student reading habits and draw conclusions from the data in a way that reflects the general population.

3. LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

Self-reporting is not a fully reliable tool, and answers in this study may have been influenced by a number of factors: faulty memory, attachment to an inaccurate self-concept, desire to provide the "right" answer, and misunderstanding of the question asked, among others. However, Northrup (1996) tells us that

> misreporting is associated with the extent of perceived question threat. Misreporting is negligible for non-threatening questions such as home ownership, low for questions about library card ownership, higher for questions about drinking and driving, and highest for questions about abortion...

How threatening a question about reading habits, or one's attitudes about reading, might be is difficult to determine, but Northrup also reminds us that questionnaires in which participation is voluntary, and in which subjects are told that their participation will contribute to important research and that all answers are acceptable, are more likely to elicit honest answers. All these conditions were met in this study.

One other limitation of this study is the small sample size. 267 students from such a large and atypical institution could not be considered representative of the institution itself, much less the general population. That said, the students surveyed came from all three levels of English 101 and, within each level, from at least two different teachers' classes. The convenience nature of the sample made it relatively diverse. One consideration for future studies would be to try to survey a more or less equal number of students from each level, as the number of MC (second-tier remedial) students surveyed was comparatively small.

Another difficulty for the purposes of this study is the identification of variables that have a concrete impact on literacy skills. It seems intuitively true that the more time a child or adolescent spends reading, the stronger their literacy skills will be. However, we see examples in this study of young adults who claim not to like reading at all and to spend no time doing it, but who nevertheless develop literacy skills strong enough that they are evaluated as needing little to no remediation; at the same time, we see students who claim to love reading, but who still struggle with written expression and/or literary comprehension and interpretation. Clearly, the relationship is not a simple one. A larger sample of the student population might give stronger evidence for the associations found in this data, and might indicate more clearly whether these cases are true anomalies.

4. SOME IMPLICATIONS

The objectives and standards for CEGEP English 101 courses, as defined by the Quebec Ministry of Education, list the following element first: “Identify the characteristics and functions of the components of literary texts” (Gouvernement du Quebec, 2016, p. 12). In later English courses, students are expected to, in English 102, “Recognize the use of literary conventions within a specific genre” and “Write a critical analysis of a literary genre” (Gouvernement du Quebec, 2016, p. 13), and, in English 103, “Recognize the treatment of a theme within a literary text” and “Write an analysis on a literary theme” (Gouvernement du Quebec, 2016, p. 13). Students must also write a province-wide literary analysis test (the English Exit Exam) before being eligible to graduate. As CEGEP English teachers, we may consider it our job to walk students through literary devices, analytical exercises, and the elements of essay composition in order to help them formulate discourses expressing their understanding of the ways authors have expressed meaning in their literary works. However, how successful are we in helping students truly understand the texts that

they are reading? If students have limited experience in reading literary texts, how deep and authentic is their comprehension; or, to put it another way, how much of their "analysis" is simply a rote exercise in which they plug paraphrases and quotations into definitions of literary elements?

Another question might be: what is the *value* of literary analysis, especially if it is such a rote exercise? If students are coming into our classrooms with little experience of reading fiction and little desire to read it, what is more important: helping them identify "themes" and "techniques," or helping them appreciate the ways that literature can help them grow, learn, know themselves, and, perhaps most importantly, give them pleasure? If students have had little opportunity to engage with literature in these ways, how will formal analysis of literary texts help them? The literature discussed here supports the idea that if a student does not read widely, effective and meaningful engagement with literary analysis may not be possible.

In order to fully apply a constructivist pedagogical approach in our classrooms, we need to have as much information as possible about our students' background knowledge and experience. If we know that the students in our classes have little experience with, and take little pleasure in, reading, for example, fiction, we can try to provide frameworks within which they can read more, and discover the pleasure of doing so, so they can take the skill of recreational reading away with them into their lives as a part of their toolbox for becoming lifelong learners.

A general understanding of the differences in 101-MA, MB and MC students' reading habits – particularly their experience with reading novels for fun – as well as their attitudes toward recreational fiction reading, is useful for teachers of these different levels in order to gauge how much a lack of experience needs to be compensated for in the classroom. However, in addition to the general knowledge provided by this study, it might also be useful for teachers to administer similar,

perhaps abbreviated, surveys to their students at the beginning of their English 101 courses (or, in fact, all English courses), or to ask students to report on their reading habits in some form. (This researcher asks 102 students to interview one another about their reading habits and preferences and to write comparative paragraphs about themselves and their partners on this topic.) Knowledge about individual students' previous reading habits, as well as their feelings about reading, could provide a basis for general class curriculum as well as individualized instruction. Approaches such as those described for a 102 course above may be difficult to implement in a remedial 101 course, in which not only must three literary genres be covered (according to Vanier's English Department policies), but considerable time and attention must be given to composition and grammar. However, adjustments can be made to maximize the focus on reading as an enjoyable activity, and to provide sufficient scaffolding to make analysis meaningful. One important component is student choice. For example, in a 101-MC class, the knowledge that 40% of students in the class did not read a novel for enjoyment in the past year might help a teacher decide to eliminate one or more fiction texts from the curriculum in order to spend more time and care on those that remain, and to make a "free reading" assignment of a novel chosen by the student a component of the course or an extra-credit activity. When student choice is a factor in readings, teachers and other students can recommend texts that are most appropriate to a student's reading experience, and this can be the beginning of more "book talk" in the classroom, a first step in creating a "community of readers."

Finally, if the data collected in this study is borne out across others – if it is in fact the case that approximately 48% of students rarely or never read books for fun; that 30% of students read no books of fiction for fun in the past year, and that 70% read 3 or fewer; that 58% spend less than an hour a week reading novels; and that 44% say that, even if given unlimited free time, they would spend either no time or less than an hour per week on this activity – then it may be time to consider whether the current Ministerial objectives for CEGEP English courses need re-examination. The world that we live in, and the backgrounds, lives and educational experiences of

the students coming into our classrooms, are very different than they were when these core objectives were first established. If the students coming into our English classrooms have little experience with fiction as a form, are we making good use of their time by asking them to analyze a form of which they have little intuitive understanding? There is an argument to be made that the analytical skills we are asking them to practice would be better applied to media they already understand on at least an experiential level (films, Netflix television series, advertising, popular songs...). Literary analysis could be included as one component of such media literacy courses, and this would make more room in English literature courses for exposure and appreciation.

5. SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Inconsistencies and a lack of statistical significance in some interesting findings suggest that some areas of this study merit further research with different or larger samples.

One topic that deserves further exploration is the question of whether novel-reading is more consistently associated with higher literacy levels than other kinds of reading. In this study, students with lower placement test results were more likely than MA students to say that they enjoyed reading nonfiction of various kinds, both in print and online. It would be worth asking a large sample of students how much of these kinds of nonfiction reading they actually do, in order to determine whether any associations appear.

Some associations that appeared in this study seemed counterintuitive, and the statistical significance of the results were weak. For example, students in the first-tier remedial level (MB) cohort were more likely than others to report spending at least one hour a week reading fiction during the previous year. Also, second-tier remedial

(MC) students reported reading four or more novels during the previous year more often than first-tier remedial (MB) students did, but again, the evidence for this relationship was not strong. It would be useful to look at a larger sample of students, and to put more stringent measures in place to account for the possible inaccuracies of self-reporting, in order to elicit more reliable data in these areas.

Some other topics addressed in this study deserve some more attention. Questions about reading in the family home could be further refined to glean more precise results; for example, students were asked if there were "a lot" of books in their households, but "a lot" was not defined. Questions about nonfiction vs. fiction reading in their families might yield some interesting data. The effect of family context on reading habits and/or literacy level is an extremely complex topic, and a multitude of studies could be done to separate the variables involved in these questions.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

If one of our goals, as English teachers, is to help our students develop skills that will improve their lives, we may need to broaden our conceptions about what those skills are and how we can teach them. We need to ask ourselves whether literary analysis, as it is taught in CEGEP English classes and evaluated on the Ministerial CEGEP English Exit Exam, is a meaningful learning activity for students for whom literature in general, and long-form fiction in particular, is unfamiliar. If it is not a meaningful activity for them, how can we serve our students in ways that will be more successful and consequential? For students who do not yet know that recreational fiction reading can be a source of deep pleasure and deep learning, English teachers have a unique opportunity. To seize it, we may need to analyze literature less, and our objectives and practices more.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Atwell, N. (2007). *The reading zone.* New York: Scholastic.

Beach, R., Appleman, D., Hynds, S., & Wilhelm, J. (2006). *Teaching literature to adolescents.* Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Belgar, D., Hunt, A., & Kite, Y. (2012) The effect of pleasure reading on Japanese university EFL learners' reading rates. *A Journal of Research in Language Studies, 62*(3), 665-703.

Cremin, T., Mottram, M., Collins, F., Powell, S., & Safford, K. Teachers as readers: Building communities of readers. *Literacy, 43*(1), 11-19.

Cullinan, B. (2000) Independent reading and school achievement. *American Association of School Librarians.* Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/aasl/aaslpubsandjournals/slmrb/slmrcontents/volume32000/independent

Daniels, H. (2002). *Literature circles: Voice and choice in book clubs and reading groups* (2nd ed.). Portland, Maine: Stenhouse.

Djikic, M., Oatley, K. & Moldoveanu, M. C. (2013). Opening the closed mind: The effect of exposure to literature on the need for closure. *Creativity Research Journal, 25*(2), 149-154.

Donald, J. G. (2002) Criticism and creativity: Thinking in the humanities. In *Learning to think: Disciplinary perspectives* (pp. 232-270). Hoboken, N.J.: Jossey-Bass.

Echols, L. D., Stanovich, K. E., West, R. F., & Zehr, K. S. (1996). Using children's literacy activities to predict growth in verbal cognitive skills: A longitudinal investigation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 88*(2), 296-304.

English Studies. (n.d.). Retrieved December 23, 2014 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/English_studies#History_of_English_studies

Flowers, T. (2003) Exploring the influence of reading for pleasure on African American high school students' reading achievement. *High School Journal, 87*(1), 58-62.

Galik, J. D. (1999) Do they read for pleasure? Recreational reading habits of college students. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 42*(6), 480-488.

Gilbert, J. & Fister, B. (2011) Reading, risk and reality: College students and reading for pleasure. *College & Research Libraries, 72*(5), 474-495.

Gladwell, M. (2008) *Outliers: The story of success.* New York: Little, Brown and Company.

Gouvernement du Québec, Ministère de l'Education et de l'Enseignement Supérieure (2016) *General education components: Extracts from programs leading to a Diploma of College Studies (DCS)* (Direction des services à la communauté anglophone, Services langagiers, trans*.)* Quebec: Gouvernement du Québec.

Hopper, R. (2005) What are teenagers reading? Adolescent fiction reading habits and reading choices. *Literacy, 39*(3), 113-120.

Howard, V. (2004) What are they reading? A survey of the reading habits and library usage patterns of teens in Nova Scotia. *The Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science, 28*(4), 25-44.

Krashen, S. D. (2004) *The power of reading: Insights from the research.* Westport, CT: Heinemann/Libraries Unlimited.

Lynch, Marianne. Personal communication. 10 August 2017.

Marraffa, M. (n.d.) Theory of mind. *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* Retrieved Apr. 30, 2015 from http://www.iep.utm.edu/theomind/

Moje, E. B., Overby, M., Tysvaery, N., & Morris, K. (2008). The complex world of adolescent literacy: Myths, motivations, and mysteries. *Harvard Educational Review, 78*(1), 107-154.

Nell, V. (1988) The psychology of reading for pleasure: Needs and gratifications. *Reading Research Quarterly, 23*(1): 6-50.

Northrup, D. A. (1996) The problem of the self-report in survey research. *Institute for Social Research Newsletter, 11*(3), http://www.math.yorku.ca/ISR/self.htm

Pollitt, K. (1994) Why we read: Canon to the right of me…. In *Reasonable creatures: Essays on Women and Feminism* (pp. 16-25). New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Richardson, V. (2003) Constructivist pedagogy. *Teachers College Record, 105*(9), 1623-1640.

Ross, C. (2000) Finding without seeking: What readers say about the role of pleasure reading as a source of information. *APLIS, 13*(2): 72-81.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Reading For Pleasure at the College Level

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this survey is to study college students' reading habits and their attitude toward reading for fun and enjoyment.

Please answer all questions. If you feel a question does not apply to you, please write "N/A" (for "not applicable").

If any question is not clear to you, please ask! It may be unclear for others as well.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

PART ONE: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Your student number: _____

Your age: _____

Your program: _____

Is this your first semester at Vanier College? YES NO

1. What is your mother tongue (the language you *first* learned to speak)?

    a. English

    b. French

    c. Other (please specify:_____)

    d. I have spoken two or more languages from birth (please specify:

    _____)

2. What language do you *usually* speak at home?

    a. English

    b. French

    c. Other (please specify:_____)

    d. I regularly speak two or more languages at home (please specify:

    _____)

3. In what language did you *primarily* study in high school?

    a. English

    b. French

    c. English/French (bilingual school)

    d. Other (please specify:_____)

PART TWO: QUESTIONS ON RECREATIONAL READING

A. General Recreational Reading:

For the purposes of this questionnaire, a "book" is a ***print or electronic text*** *equivalent to at least 100 pages of print text. For example, the novel* The Fault in our Stars *is a book.*

An issue of a magazine is not a book, even if it is 100 pages long. A single comic book magazine is not a book, but a comic book compilation is a book if it is at least 100 pages long.

1. Do you like to read books for fun in your free time?
   a. YES!
   b. SOMETIMES
   c. RARELY
   d. NO!

2. What kinds of books do you like? Circle ALL that apply to you.
   a. Fiction (imaginary stories. Includes genre fiction like romance, mystery, horror, etc.).
   b. Personal narrative (true stories about the authors' lives).
   c. Other non-fiction books (history, biography, books about psychology, culture, science, etc.)
   d. Poetry.
   e. Other. Specify the type of book:_____.
   f. I don't really like reading any kind of book.

3. What *other* kinds of texts do you like to read? Circle ALL that apply to you.

   a. Print newspapers.

   b. Print magazines.

   c. Online newspapers, magazines or other journalism.

   d. Blogs.

   e. Comics (other than book-length comics/graphic novels)

   f. Other. Specify the type of text:_____.

   g. I don't really like reading any kind of text.

4. When reading texts of any kind for enjoyment in the last year (September 2015 until now), did you mostly read in English?

   a. YES, I mostly read in English.

   b. NO, I mostly read in one or more other languages. (Please specify: _____)

   c. I did not read any texts for enjoyment in the last year.

B. Fiction Books:

Note: "Fiction" means stories created from the author's imagination. Examples of fiction texts would be books like the Harry Potter *series,* The Fault in our Stars*,* The Hunger Games *or* Diary of a Wimpy Kid*. Romance, horror, mystery and other genres are all examples of fiction.*

1. In the past year (September 2015 until now), approximately how many books of FICTION have you read for your own enjoyment (books that were not required for school, work or some other mandatory activity)?

   a. None (0)

   b. Not many (1 – 3)

   c. A few (4 – 6)

   d. A fair number (7 – 9)

   e. Lots! (10 or more. Specify: approximately how many?_____)

Please give an example of a title of a fiction book you read: _____. (If you did not read any books of fiction for your enjoyment, write "n/a" in the blank above.)

2. In the past year (September 2015 until now), approximately how much time have you spent each week reading books of FICTION for your own enjoyment (books that were not required for school, work or some other mandatory activity)?

   a. No time (0 hours)

   b. Very little time (More than 0 hours but less than 1 hour)

   c. Little time (More than 1 hour but less than 2 hours)

   d. A fair amount of time (More than 2 hours but less than 4 hours)

e. A lot of time (More than 4 hours. Specify: approximately how much time?_____)

3. If you had as much free time as you wanted during a week, how much of that free time do you think you would spend reading books of FICTION for your own enjoyment?

a. No time (0 hours)

b. Very little time (More than 0 hours but less than 1 hour)

c. Little time (More than 1 hour but less than 2 hours)

d. A fair amount of time (More than 2 hours but less than 4 hours)

e. A lot of time (More than 4 hours. Specify: approximately how much time?_____)

C. Additional Information:

Please write a few sentences about your family's reading habits and preferences. For example:

- Do your parents/guardians enjoy reading?
- When you were growing up, were there a lot of books in your household(s)? If so, what kinds of books were they? Did they include a lot of fiction?
- If your family did not read a lot, what kinds of activities did they consider more important or entertaining?
- Do your reading habits resemble those of other people in your family?

Please give as much detail as you can about the activity of reading and its importance in your upbringing.

Please return your survey to the surveyor.

If you would like to learn about the results of this study, please contact Dana Bath through MIO or at bathd@vaniercollege.qc.ca in about 12 months time.

Thank you very much for your help!

APPENDIX B

CONSENT FORM

VANIER
CÉGEP/COLLEGE

CONSENT FORM

Title of the Research

The Pleasure of the Extra-curricular Text: Long-form Recreational Fiction Reading and College-level Literacy Achievement

Researcher(s)

Dana Bath, B.A., B.Ed., M.A.

English Department, Vanier College

514-744-7500 x 7814

bathd@vaniercollege.qc.ca

Participants are invited to call or email at any time during the college semester to ask questions about the research. Telephone and email messages will be returned within 24 business hours when college is in session. Participants with questions before or after the college semester should email, and include a telephone number if they wish to speak on the phone.

Description of the Research

This research aims to collect information on English 101 students' recreational reading habits. Students will be surveyed about their reading habits and preferences, and the information they provide will be associated with their achievement on the Vanier College Placement Test.

Participants in the research are asked to do the following:

1. Complete a survey questionnaire early in the A16 semester, during their English class time, and
2. Agree to allow the researcher to access and analyze the written production portion of the Vanier College Placement Test that they completed before being placed in their English 101 course.

Potential Harms

There are no known harms associated with your participation in this research.

Potential Benefits

You will not benefit directly from participation in this research.

However, you will benefit yourself and other students, as well as researchers, teachers and society, by contributing to better understanding of factors that contribute to student literacy skills.

Confidentiality

Confidentiality will be respected. No information that discloses your identity will be released or published.
Participation Participation in research must be voluntary. If you choose not to participate, you will continue to have access to quality education. If you choose to participate and later decide to change your mind, you can say no and stop the research at any time, up to the time when data analysis begins. Again, you will continue to have access to quality education. Once the research is complete, if you wish to have access to the findings, they will be shared with you upon request.
Statement of Consent I certify that I have read the above information, understand the risks, benefits, responsibilities and conditions of participation as outlined in this document, understand that I may ask questions in the future regarding this research, and freely consent to participate in the Recreational Reading and Literacy Achievement project. I agree to complete the survey questionnaire provided, and to allow the researcher access to my online Vanier College English Placement Test. Name: Signature: Date:

APPENDIX C

LETTER OF APPROVAL FROM THE VANIER COLLEGE RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

VANIER
CÉGEP / COLLEGE
Learning today. Leading tomorrow.

VANIER COLLEGE
RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD
RESEARCH CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that the Research Ethics Board of Vanier College has examined the research proposal by Dana Bath
name of applicant(s)

entitled _ The Pleasure of the Extra-curricular Text: Long-form Recreational Fiction Reading and College-level Literacy Achievement (Pilot Project)
title of project

Ethics approval is granted for a period of one year from the date of this certificate. After that date, all research must cease unless an application for renewal has been approved. A final report summarizing the findings of the study should be sent to the Vanier College Research Office within six months of study completion.
Any changes or modifications to approved instruments and/or procedures must be submitted through a new application, to the Vanier College Research Ethics Board prior to the collection of data.

RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD MEMBERS

Karen White- Chair

James Pan

Allan Insleay

Marie-Sophia Grabowiecki

Toby Moneit

November 26, 2015
Date

Board Chair

APPENDIX D

ADDITIONAL TABLES

Table 16a
"Do you like to read personal narrative?": By Cohort

		Likes Pers Narr		
		No	Yes	Total
MA	Count	82	31	113
	% within 101 Level	**72.6%**	**27.4%**	100.0%
	% within Likes Pers Narr	42.5%	41.9%	42.3%
	% of Total	30.7%	11.6%	42.3%
MB	Count	79	26	105
	% within 101 Level	**75.2%**	**24.8%**	100.0%
	% within Likes Pers Narr	40.9%	35.1%	39.3%
	% of Total	29.6%	9.7%	39.3%
MC	Count	32	17	49
	% within 101 Level	**65.3%**	**34.7%**	100.0%
	% within Likes Pers Narr	16.6%	23.0%	18.4%
	% of Total	12.0%	6.4%	18.4%
	Count	193	74	267
	% within 101 Level	72.3%	27.7%	100.0%
	% within Likes Pers Narr	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	72.3%	27.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.653[a]	2	.438
Likelihood Ratio	1.610	2	.447
Linear-by-Linear Association	.474	1	.491
N of Valid Cases	267		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.58.

Table 16b
"Do you like to read other non-fiction?": By Cohort

		Likes Other Non-fiction		
		No	Yes	Total
MA	Count	78	35	113
	% within 101 Level	**69.0%**	**31.0%**	100.0%
	% within Likes Other Non-fiction	40.8%	46.1%	42.3%
	% of Total	29.2%	13.1%	42.3%
MB	Count	84	21	105
	% within 101 Level	**80.0%**	**20.0%**	100.0%
	% within Likes Other Non-fiction	44.0%	27.6%	39.3%
	% of Total	31.5%	7.9%	39.3%
MC	Count	29	20	49
	% within 101 Level	**59.2%**	**40.8%**	100.0%
	% within Likes Other Non-fiction	15.2%	26.3%	18.4%
	% of Total	10.9%	7.5%	18.4%
Total	Count	191	76	267
	% within 101 Level	71.5%	28.5%	100.0%
	% within Likes Other Non-fiction	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	71.5%	28.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.715[a]	2	.021
Likelihood Ratio	7.732	2	.021
Linear-by-Linear Association	.345	1	.557
N of Valid Cases	267		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.95.

Table 16c
"I do not like reading any kind of book": By Cohort

		Does Not Like Books		
		Didn't Choose	Does not Like Books	Total
MA	Count	105	8	113
	% within 101 Level	**92.9%**	**7.1%**	100.0%
	% within Does Not Like Books	44.1%	27.6%	42.3%
	% of Total	39.3%	3.0%	42.3%
MB	Count	91	14	105
	% within 101 Level	**86.7%**	**13.3%**	100.0%
	% within Does Not Like Books	38.2%	48.3%	39.3%
	% of Total	34.1%	5.2%	39.3%
MC	Count	42	7	49
	% within 101 Level	**85.7%**	**14.3%**	100.0%
	% within Does Not Like Books	17.6%	24.1%	18.4%
	% of Total	15.7%	2.6%	18.4%
Total	Count	238	29	267
	% within 101 Level	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%
	% within Does Not Like Books	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	89.1%	10.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.925[a]	2	.232
Likelihood Ratio	3.047	2	.218
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.485	1	.115
N of Valid Cases	267		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.32.

Table 16d
"Do you like to read print newspapers?": By Cohort

		Likes Print Newspapers		
		No	Yes	Total
MA	Count	87	26	113
	% within 101 Level	77.0%	23.0%	100.0%
	% within Likes Print Newspapers	42.0%	43.3%	42.3%
	% of Total	32.6%	9.7%	42.3%
MB	Count	89	16	105
	% within 101 Level	84.8%	15.2%	100.0%
	% within Likes Print Newspapers	43.0%	26.7%	39.3%
	% of Total	33.3%	6.0%	39.3%
MC	Count	31	18	49
	% within 101 Level	63.3%	36.7%	100.0%
	% within Likes Print Newspapers	15.0%	30.0%	18.4%
	% of Total	11.6%	6.7%	18.4%
	Count	207	60	267
	% within 101 Level	77.5%	22.5%	100.0%
	% within Likes Print Newspapers	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	77.5%	22.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.894[a]	2	.012
Likelihood Ratio	8.554	2	.014
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.588	1	.208
N of Valid Cases	267		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.01.

Table 16e
"Do you like to read magazines?": By Cohort

		Likes Print Magazines		
		No	Yes	Total
MA	Count	81	32	113
	% within 101 Level	71.7%	28.3%	100.0%
	% within Likes Print Magazines	43.5%	39.5%	42.3%
	% of Total	30.3%	12.0%	42.3%
MB	Count	71	34	105
	% within 101 Level	67.6%	32.4%	100.0%
	% within Likes Print Magazines	38.2%	42.0%	39.3%
	% of Total	26.6%	12.7%	39.3%
MC	Count	34	15	49
	% within 101 Level	69.4%	30.6%	100.0%
	% within Likes Print Magazines	18.3%	18.5%	18.4%
	% of Total	12.7%	5.6%	18.4%
Total	Count	186	81	267
	% within 101 Level	69.7%	30.3%	100.0%
	% within Likes Print Magazines	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	69.7%	30.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.427[a]	2	.808
Likelihood Ratio	.427	2	.808
Linear-by-Linear Association	.188	1	.665
N of Valid Cases	267		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.87.

Table 16f
"Do you like to read online journalism?": By Cohort

		Likes Online Journalism		
		No	Yes	Total
MA	Count	50	63	113
	% within 101 Level	44.2%	55.8%	100.0%
	% within Likes Online Journalism	38.2%	46.3%	42.3%
	% of Total	18.7%	23.6%	42.3%
MB	Count	58	47	105
	% within 101 Level	55.2%	44.8%	100.0%
	% within Likes Online Journalism	44.3%	34.6%	39.3%
	% of Total	21.7%	17.6%	39.3%
MC	Count	23	26	49
	% within 101 Level	46.9%	53.1%	100.0%
	% within Likes Online Journalism	17.6%	19.1%	18.4%
	% of Total	8.6%	9.7%	18.4%
Total	Count	131	136	267
	% within 101 Level	49.1%	50.9%	100.0%
	% within Likes Online Journalism	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	49.1%	50.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.739[a]	2	.254
Likelihood Ratio	2.744	2	.254
Linear-by-Linear Association	.526	1	.468
N of Valid Cases	267		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 24.04.

Table 16g
"Do you like to read blogs?": By Cohort

		Likes Blogs		
		No	Yes	Total
MA	Count	78	35	113
	% within 101 Level	69.0%	31.0%	100.0%
	% within Likes Blogs	45.9%	36.1%	42.3%
	% of Total	29.2%	13.1%	42.3%
MB	Count	62	43	105
	% within 101 Level	59.0%	41.0%	100.0%
	% within Likes Blogs	36.5%	44.3%	39.3%
	% of Total	23.2%	16.1%	39.3%
MC	Count	30	19	49
	% within 101 Level	61.2%	38.8%	100.0%
	% within Likes Blogs	17.6%	19.6%	18.4%
	% of Total	11.2%	7.1%	18.4%
Total	Count	170	97	267
	% within 101 Level	63.7%	36.3%	100.0%
	% within Likes Blogs	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	63.7%	36.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.498[a]	2	.287
Likelihood Ratio	2.515	2	.284
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.544	1	.214
N of Valid Cases	267		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.80.

Table 16h
"Do you like to read comics?": By Cohort

		Likes Comics		
		No	Yes	Total
MA	Count	69	44	113
	% within 101 Level	61.1%	38.9%	100.0%
	% within Likes Comics	40.4%	45.8%	42.3%
	% of Total	25.8%	16.5%	42.3%
MB	Count	66	39	105
	% within 101 Level	62.9%	37.1%	100.0%
	% within Likes Comics	38.6%	40.6%	39.3%
	% of Total	24.7%	14.6%	39.3%
MC	Count	36	13	49
	% within 101 Level	73.5%	26.5%	100.0%
	% within Likes Comics	21.1%	13.5%	18.4%
	% of Total	13.5%	4.9%	18.4%
Total	Count	171	96	267
	% within 101 Level	64.0%	36.0%	100.0%
	% within Likes Comics	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	64.0%	36.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.391[a]	2	.303
Likelihood Ratio	2.477	2	.290
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.883	1	.170
N of Valid Cases	267		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 17.62.

Table 16i
"I do not like reading any kind of text": By Cohort

		Does Not Like Reading Texts		
		Didn't Choose	Doesn't Like Reading Texts	Total
MA	Count	102	11	113
	% within 101 Level	90.3%	9.7%	100.0%
	% within Does Not Like Reading Texts	42.5%	40.7%	42.3%
	% of Total	38.2%	4.1%	42.3%
MB	Count	95	10	105
	% within 101 Level	90.5%	9.5%	100.0%
	% within Does Not Like Reading Texts	39.6%	37.0%	39.3%
	% of Total	35.6%	3.7%	39.3%
MC	Count	43	6	49
	% within 101 Level	87.8%	12.2%	100.0%
	% within Does Not Like Reading Texts	17.9%	22.2%	18.4%
	% of Total	16.1%	2.2%	18.4%
	Count	240	27	267
	% within 101 Level	89.9%	10.1%	100.0%
	% within Does Not Like Reading Texts	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	89.9%	10.1%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.303[a]	2	.859
Likelihood Ratio	.290	2	.865
Linear-by-Linear Association	.162	1	.687
N of Valid Cases	267		

a. 1 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.96.